

Charles A. Ottmann, Livingston.
 Fred Jacobsen, Roscoe.
 Mary E. Rozier, Tuolumne.
 Charles W. Deming, Universal City.

HAWAII

Antone Fernandez, Kekaha.

ILLINOIS

Howard J. Hall, Elburn.
 Daniel L. Cobb, Highland Park.
 Dwight S. Sharer, Mount Morris.
 William Claude Rogers, Sr., Percy.

INDIANA

Emma Knesek, Cedar Lake.

IOWA

Frank C. Hentges, Le Mars.
 Boies Capper, Postville.

KANSAS

Rollie O. Tobias, Liberal.
 Florence J. Lehman, Nickerson.
 Fred Moffitt, Tampa.

KENTUCKY

Beulah A. Foley, Ravenna.
 Charles L. Hollingsworth, Smithland.
 Haden Owens, Wickliffe.

MAINE

Grace L. Harriman, Searsport.
 Philip B. Seavey, Sherman Mills.

MARYLAND

Nettie Fowler, Bowie.

MICHIGAN

Earl B. Sill, Cassopolis.
 Blanche L. Mann, Ortonville.
 James Reid, Port Huron.
 Helen MacMillan, St. Clair Shores.

MISSISSIPPI

Luna B. Stocks, Baldwyn.
 Lily B. McDonald, Bay Springs.
 William D. Fisher, Dundee.
 Edward Otis Johnson, Glen Allan.
 David C. Branham, Jr., Itta Bena.
 Clarence E. Bilbo, Magnolia.
 Lilly M. Wilson, Marks.
 Abbie A. Cunningham, Raymond.

MONTANA

Jennie W. Chowning, Ennis.

NEW JERSEY

William J. Lawlor, Carteret.
 George A. Keenan, Clifton.
 William J. Maloney, Fords.
 Cornelius S. Hoff, Frenchtown.
 Lottie A. Cubberley, Hamilton Square.
 Francis W. Lyman, Lincoln Park.
 Floyd Smith, Montville.
 William J. Reynolds, Newfoundland.
 Anne C. Murphy, North Hackensack.
 Anthony V. Gross, Passaic.
 Bessie M. Lippincott, Pemberton.
 George Nock, Pompton Plains.
 Margaret A. Esposito, Sicklerville.
 Frances B. Tonking, Tabor.
 Peter F. Martin, Waldwick.
 Irma Goodman, Woodbine.

NEW YORK

Leonard S. Cole, Ovid.
 George H. Stanton, Pine Bush.
 Anton K. Dickson, Shelter Island Heights.
 Albert Prindle, Shushan.
 William C. Long, Tully.

NORTH CAROLINA

Edna E. Maurer, Aberdeen.
 Pinckney R. Holman, Ridgecrest.

OHIO

Chalmer R. Hayes, Brookville.
 August Fellerath, Gypsum.
 Earl F. Reeb, Newark.
 Robert D. Fisher, Warrensville.

OKLAHOMA

Ruth S. Howe, Helena.
 Charles Williams, Hooker.
 Eleanor Barnhill, Stringtown.

OREGON

Gaphart D. Ebner, Mount Angel.

PENNSYLVANIA

Daniel F. Scobie, Baden.

TENNESSEE

Robert Royce Jones, Dyersburg.
 Nona C. Armstrong, Martel.

TEXAS

Addison Lysander Lincecum, El Campo.
 Helen M. Peel, Jourdanston.
 A. Earl Estes, Monahans.
 Joe Marecek, Rowena.
 Ethridge C. Fowler, Silverton.
 Annie E. Finn, Sunset.

UTAH

Elliott Larsen, Monroe.
 Pontha Calder, Vernal.

VIRGINIA

Robert H. Wall, Cambria.
 Bessie S. Burgess, Fork Union.
 Gustavus A. Scruggs, Salem.

WASHINGTON

Dessie M. Hewett, Lyle.
 Daniel L. Jackson, Port Gamble.

WEST VIRGINIA

John T. Hollandsworth, Jr., Beckley.
 Benjamin F. Penix, Belle.

WISCONSIN

Victoria St. Angelo, Frederic.
 August W. Frisch, New Holstein.
 Bertram A. Ruskauff, Saukville.
 Russell E. Burlingame, Statesan.
 Richard M. Grimsrud, Westby.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, we pray Thee, and stretch forth Thine hand from above. Hold us back from presumptuous sins and keep us free from the ignoble delights of pride and revenge. Heavenly Father, purify our hearts and justify our daily conduct by kindling and fortifying every gift and privilege of our complex lives. Concerned as we are with the rights and the enrichment of humanity, we beseech Thee that the poor in this abundant land may be blessed with peace and plenty. Lord God of the nations, remember most mercifully our country; may it strive for those ideals that make a nation great and glorious. Hasten the day when Thy promises shall be fulfilled and the knowledge of the truth shall be abroad in all the world. In the name of our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of

his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 8, 1936, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7680. An act to amend the act of May 18, 1934, providing punishment for killing or assaulting Federal officers; and

H. R. 7995. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Arkansas River and Fourche Bayou with a view to the control of floods in the vicinity of Little Rock and North Little Rock, Ark.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, there is much misunderstanding as to what may be regarded as neutrality and who is to specify same. We will soon have the Neutrality Act of 1936 for discussion before this House. Were we to adopt this act of neutrality, what would be our rights in carrying on trade and commerce? What about our freedom of the seas? The very things which we have fought and died for, and have always upheld before the world for the past 140 years as a symbol of our democratic principles and government, are they to be sacrificed?

This drastic legislation is inconsistent with the purpose of the merchant marine bill that came before this House last year and S. 3500 which will come before us this year.

The Members of this House will recall during the last session how anxious we were to stabilize our world trade by building up our American merchant marine, which today is emerging from trade misery. Why paralyze that trade now by the restrictions called for in section 4 of this act, which, if enacted, would certainly create havoc and perhaps cause collapse of our American industry and commerce.

Why should we forfeit our neutral rights by giving up the freedom of the seas? With our ships anchored in our harbors the result would be closed factories and increased unemployment. We have already had a taste of this and a very bitter one. Can you imagine if millions more were unemployed? This would give rise to a condition which would be very hard to cope with and which would perhaps destroy our economic well-being.

However, some believe to forfeit our neutral rights would mean peace. I am positively sure that the enactment of this law can in no way guarantee the United States peace. We are now at peace, but to my way of thinking the enactment of this bill with all its present decorations will inevitably lead us into war rather than keep us out of war. For it is admitted that this neutrality act certainly is not any guaranty that we would not be drawn into a war.

The trade restrictions called for in section 4, prohibiting shipment from the United States to belligerent countries of certain articles and materials in excess of a normal amount, except food, medical supplies, and clothing materials, violates not only international law but also the commercial treaties of the United States, as admitted in section 16. It would cause further controversies with foreign countries and hinder international trade. This would immediately encourage the expansion of the trade of foreign countries and stifle our own markets. It would give internationalists a chance to thrive while we are locked in port. We would not only create unfriendly relations with all foreign countries, but at the same time create internal strife within our own borders. We certainly do not want that.

Section 4 of this bill not only applies restrictions to belligerents but also to neutrals, "or to any neutral country for transshipment to or for the use of any belligerent country in excess of a normal amount in quantity and kind, of exports from the United States to the respective belligerent countries." Do we not recall that we were unable to control prohibition within our own borders? Then, how can we control the ships and nations of the world? How

can we prevent the ships on the seas from carrying on unlawful trade not only with the belligerent countries but with the neutral countries as well, who might transship to any belligerent? Why should we act as "police of the world"? Why be so blind as not to foresee trouble? Should this policy be adopted, the friction resulting therefrom would sooner or later cause a break in our diplomatic relations with some country.

International law authorizes no such limitations of exports other than arms, munitions, and implements of war. Why should the United States as a neutral country inaugurate a law that cannot fulfill its purpose?

Should this act go into effect, the questions that would arise from our private industries, as to the shipment of the normal quota would be: Who will be the chosen few to receive permission to ship this normal quota? How is it going to be divided? et cetera. This would mean more headaches for our Government.

I cannot see any reason why we, as a fair-minded, right-thinking Nation, should restrict shipment to any country that has been on most friendly terms with the United States just because some greedy European country has stirred us into action and at the same time sits smilingly silent waiting for this Congress to act on this bill.

Do we not recall what Stanley Baldwin, Prime Minister of England, said in Glasgow last November?—

Never as long as I have any responsibility in the Government will I sanction the British Navy's being used for an armed blockade until I know what the United States is going to do.

What does this mean? Why should we participate in any international scheme or alliance? This holds true today. Why has the League of Nations, under British generalship, postponed sanctions so often? It is simply waiting for the United States to get in line and in step.

For God's sake, America, is it not time for you to keep yourself free from any European entanglement by following a policy of minding your own business rather than joining hands with the League, which would inevitably lead us into a European war?

Let us not forget that sanctions is an act of war, and that oil embargo is a transition from economic to military sanction, which means war. The question arises, Do we want to become involved in a war which will aid England or any other European country, or shall we maintain a true neutral standing? We are still paying the price for the "Follies of 1917." We Americans will never hesitate to shoulder arms for the protection of our own rights, interests, and welfare, but never again for any European interest. Then why should we enact this neutrality bill, which is bound to entangle us in this or any European conflict? Why should we interfere with any European disorder or confusion? Why should we apply sanctions or restrict trade to the belligerents of today? We are not a member of the League. It has so been determined by the rank and file of the American people. Then, for Heaven's sake, let us stay neutral by minding our own business.

There is no question of the fact that we want to maintain peace. We do, however, not at the price of submission to the dictates of any foreign country, but rather that peace which we now have and enjoy and wish to maintain through our cordial relationship with all the countries of the world as heretofore, and continue our lawful trade with them, which has been and still is the true American policy.

We know what arms and munitions are, but implements of war, that is the bugaboo. This has set master minds thinking. Definitions by the Senate of the United States as to what constitutes arms, munitions, and implements of war, when the Senate ratified the Convention of Geneva in 1925, did not include any raw material in any of the definitions given for implements of war. Now, let us see what happened. Last November, as you recall, the League declared sanctions against Italy. Immediately thereafter, our Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, asked for a moral embargo on oil to Italy. Why did he pick on oil? He knew and the League knew that Italy needs oil to carry on her campaign.

This unauthorized ruling by the Secretary of State certainly did cause some disturbance of our peaceful Nation, especially where it affected American citizens of Italian parentage.

It was not the intent of Congress, in the passage of the Neutrality Act of 1935, that implements of war should include raw material. Why does our Secretary of State class oil as an implement of war?

There are bound to be many discrepancies as to what is regarded as "implements of war." I intend, therefore, to offer an amendment in section 2 defining "implements of war", for the sole purpose of having a definite knowledge, once and for all times, of what is incorporated in this phrase, so that we may know what material we may be allowed to ship even under the normal quota limit. You will notice in section 4, page 4, line 4, of this act, before being revised, read, "would contribute to a prolongation or expansion of the war." This, to my way of thinking, jibes with the wish of the administration, as shown by the act of the Secretary of State last November, when he called for an embargo on oil to Italy under the subterfuge of claiming that this was the best means of shortening the war. In other words, it was a direct attempt to penalize Italy—thus encouraging her defeat. Surely this is not true neutrality. Why should we be a pawn in the hands of some foreign nation?

ISOLATION

Some are of the opinion that we should completely isolate ourselves during the period of war. This is foolhardy, for it would be most disastrous. Advocates of the complete embargo provision, though not in the present House bill, are willing to sacrifice the American trade and economic well-being, rather than lose one life in battle. Yet they claim that complete isolation is no guarantee against war. Complete isolation from the world will not only instill hatred and revenge in the minds of European countries but invite dissension and uprising within our own borders, particularly at this time when the patience of the people and of industry is at its lowest ebb. An immediate change of the law would be demanded by the people.

America will find herself then in a position for ridicule, and the loss of American prestige would render her subject to a possible attack by some European country simply on account of this cowardical act. This would be suicidal.

The cry, "Peace at any price", is heard from all corners of the globe. We are at peace. Why should we run the risk of being drawn into any international conflict? There cannot be any perfect neutrality bill enacted into law that will keep us out of future wars. Even extreme isolation with marked deprivation of our individual rights, a contradiction of American policy, is apt to break our diplomatic relations, not only with the belligerent countries but with the neutral countries as well.

Of course I am for peace. I also am in favor of prohibition of export of arms, munitions, and implements of war to any country at war or to any neutral country that tends to transship to any belligerent country. And I would also curtail loans and credit to any belligerent country, but I do not think it advisable to restrict trade. I suggest, therefore, that we adhere to international law and uphold the true American tradition by reenacting the Neutrality Act of 1935.

THE FOUR VITAL FACTORS OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I asked and was granted permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a speech delivered by ex-Senator Hawes before the North American Wildlife Conference, entitled "The Four Vital Factors of Wildlife Conservation."

Many of us know the serious problem which confronts us, with 40,000,000 acres of forest land being destroyed, with soil erosion causing a loss of \$400,000,000 a year, with our migratory birds facing extinction, and with 85 percent of our streams polluted. The President called a conference in Washington. Ex-Senator Hawes, a recognized authority on the subject, delivered a wonderful address that I should like to see inserted in the RECORD so that we may have

copies printed at private expense, and sent throughout the United States in order to let the people know about this serious problem. At that time, I did not have an estimate from the Public Printer. I now have the estimate and renew my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Harry B. Hawes before the North American Wildlife Conference at Washington, D. C., February 6, 1936:

The four vital factors in the wildlife conservation movement are: The Federal factor, the State factor, the farmer factor, and the sportsman factor.

The conservation movement will not meet with practical success unless there is united effort and cooperation among these four vital elements. The first two involve the law machinery of the Nation and the 48 States, the last two are a matter of education and persuasion.

It is quite unnecessary to prove there is a shortage in our wildlife of both fish and game. The proof is adequate. The evidence comes from every source.

In the Federal field the attempt to count migratory birds results in a mere guess. No one can count them on the breeding grounds, and certainly they cannot be counted in the air. They wheel and circle; they pass through at night at a speed of some 30 to 50 miles an hour.

The human eye and brain can only guess their numbers, but fortunately the duck-stamp bill has given us something more substantial, more understandable, and more reliable than the mere guess.

And this information is so alarming, conclusive, and distressing that it demands your earnest, thoughtful consideration.

In the season of 1934-35 there were sold 635,344 migratory-bird hunting stamps. It is reported that in the 1935-36 season up to date of December 21, 1935, only 356,000 duck stamps were sold.

This shows that in that period nearly 280,000 sportsmen refrained from migratory-bird shooting, a decrease of nearly 50 percent.

Whether these 280,000 have permanently abandoned the field because of shortage or because of an overregulation is problematical.

It may be reasonably assumed, however, that these 280,000 guns were not put aside permanently, but were used on upland game birds and animals. Whether they have permanently retired from the field of hunting or changed the field from migratory birds to crowd upland game birds has not been ascertained.

Conservationists are assembled today, as I understand it, for two definite purposes. The first is to prepare a definite program and devise means for carrying out a practical organization plan of saving both game and fish seed stock and for its replacement.

We have been proposing plans that are vague and uncertain. The time has come to shoot with a rifle at certain fixed targets, with certain definite objectives. Our danger arises from the fact that we must know where the bullet goes. Shooting in underbrush always carries with it a hazard. We should know what we want now before we go on our way.

The backbone of the movement must necessarily be the hunter and the fisherman who pay the State conservation bill. Intelligently organized, with definite, sensible objectives, the hunter and the fisherman can wield a greater influence than any single industry or occupation or any other sport in the United States.

Game is not a mechanical thing. Taken into possession, it is food of a delectable, healthy, and appetizing character. Reduced to possession, it has an economic value in the life of the Nation running into many, many millions of dollars.

We cannot restore primitive conditions, but we believe that the factors inimical to the great outdoors can be counterbalanced by modern methods of game and fish replacement.

We may search for a utopia, but we will not find it. We may place an ideal so high that it could never be reached. We may propose plans so impracticable that they will destroy the attainable, the enforceable.

I trust you will pardon me if in what follows I appear to be too precise in my recommendations.

My long experience is my apology. For over 40 years the subject has been a hobby. I carried it into the legislature of my State, into the National House of Representatives, into the United States Senate, as a member of the Federal Migratory Bird Commission, and discussed it with hunters and fishermen in conventions throughout the United States and Canada, and as a member of every national organization for conservation that has stood the test of time.

With this explanation of the definite recommendations I shall make, I give them to you for frank criticism, for approval or rejection, hoping they will be helpful, but with no thought that they are necessarily right and all-inclusive or that they are not subject to change or modification.

I plead only experience—some of it sad—with the hope that out of this great meeting will come an organized, harmonious, persistent effort to bring back nature's heritage and hand it down to our boys and girls in replenished abundance.

THE FEDERAL FACTOR

The Federal Government owns approximately 400,000,000 acres of land, and it may control and direct the disposition of wildlife on this land through congressional action.

It has no control or direction with respect to the 1,500,000,000 acres of privately owned State land excepting that which is given by courtesy. The State legislatures have authority over this private property.

Efforts have been made to place all game under the control of the Federal Government. In each case these efforts have proved abortive, they have never made any advance. In my opinion they have no possible chance of success, for the States will never yield their local prerogatives, and they should not yield.

It is unthinkable that a Federal bureau should determine the local problem of each State. A man from Connecticut should not direct what should be done in Texas, nor the man who lives in Texas decide what should be done in North Dakota.

Population, characteristics, geographical conditions, habits, and environment will not permit this to be done.

It cannot be done under any circumstances without a new amendment to the Constitution, which can be defeated by a little over one-third of the Congress or one-fourth of the States.

There are two other forms of Federal direction. One is its powerful example set by national investigations, reports, and recommendations, its pamphlets, its educational services, and its cooperation with States.

The other form of direction comes from a treaty which might be withdrawn, and there is always the possibility—although I hope it will never happen—that zealots may bring its repeal by over-regulation, just as there came a repeal of our prohibition amendment because it went too far and was therefore not susceptible of enforcement.

I refer to the migratory-bird treaty with Canada, for it is a strange and interesting historical fact that because of their migratory habits, and for that reason alone, certain birds and waterfowl have extended Federal jurisdiction and initiated a novel method of legislative enactment predicated upon a treaty concluded between two sovereign nations, the United States and Great Britain.

Had it not been for the migratory habit of these game birds, the powers of the Biological Survey would have been limited exclusively to the control of game on property owned by the United States.

We have a limitation on Federal authority, therefore, very clearly defined. Our problem seems to be to improve the machinery of this Federal control. How can it be done? First and in part by—

A consolidation of all Federal conservation agencies under one control—that is, either under a new department or under a secretary, reporting directly to the President, or through the designation by the President of some one official who shall have real authority to secure by mandatory process the active, practical cooperation of those departments covered by the Coordination Act.

Until a new consolidation of organic resources is perfected, and, pending the creation of one conservation department, either by act of Congress or by request upon the President, a coordinator or director, with power to secure cooperation and effective administration for conservation should be created. This director or coordinator, in my opinion, should report directly to the President to avoid opposition and some natural jealousies from other departments.

We should demand action under the coordination bill, team work, and practical results.

What is everybody's business we find is nobody's business.

If departments will not act voluntarily as the law provides, an official selected by the President and vested with authority can force cooperation or at least publicly place where it belongs the responsibility for failure to cooperate.

The advisory board should be restored to full vigor and power. This board came into existence nearly a quarter of a century ago and has met each year for conference until the year 1935. Then, for the first time, it did not meet, and the opinions of its members were obtained by written questionnaires. It should be restored and revitalized.

The President, acting through the Secretary of Agriculture, can select a representative board, having due regard for regional and geographical location, thus making it a most valuable agency in fact collecting and for consultation and advice.

We must preserve a publicly known advisory board or it will degenerate into an unofficial advisory board whose members are not responsible to the public; or, stated in another way, advisers known to the public may be replaced by unknown advisers with no official responsibility.

We should preserve a publicly known group for what may become private meetings of "tailors of Tooley Street."

Its success or failure, however, hinges upon the absolute independence of thought and conviction of its members, on proper geographical representation, and upon freedom of opportunity to discuss, even to criticize, proposed regulations.

It would be useless to have a board unless these factors are recognized. To make of it a mere "rubber stamp", or a board whose opinions were not ascertained by personal exchange in meeting, would be a mere waste of time and would be of little value.

Experts from the various departments should appear and answer questions and give the board the benefit of their scientific knowledge and investigation.

Added to this, members of the advisory board would bring facts from their respective sections. They could exchange opinions, and experts of the Government should frankly and freely discuss the results of their official observations.

As I have said, the members of the board should have complete independence of thought and conviction, and their selection in the future should be scrutinized with great care by the sportsmen's organizations of the United States.

Membership on the board would then be considered a very high honor and there would be attracted to it the best thought of the best conservationists in America.

Many splendid men and one fine woman have served on these boards in the past. They have given very unselfishly of their time, and most of them have had the courage to express their convictions.

Its membership should be enlarged, and no new migratory-bird regulations should be promulgated until they have been presented for this board's consideration.

I recommend the board's restoration in enlarged form, with greater authority and independence, and that all efforts to make of it a "rubber stamp" be defeated.

No 1 man's mind is better than 20 men's minds. There may exist a man with a brain more commanding than all others, but we have not yet discovered such a man. Personally, I do not think he exists.

Members should be selected with regard to regional residence and experience. To concentrate its membership in one section and omit representation from other sections will defeat the object of securing a diversified personal contact experience so valuable and so necessary in the solution of a problem as diversified as that of Federal game control.

The name "Bureau of Biological Survey" does not carry with it an explanation of the duties of that agency. A change in its name has been recommended from time to time by Senate and House committees, by individual game organizations, and by outstanding conservationists.

It is no reflection upon the men who serve in that bureau that its name should be changed. In fact, it is a commendation of their growing influence and extended jurisdiction.

Biology is only a small though important part of the problem, but the designation "Biological Survey" does not now carry its true story to our people.

A national experimental station or game farm should be created in the vicinity of the National Capital for research and experimental purposes.

Here training could be given in game management, game breeding, and in the study and treatment of disease.

Students entering this institution should be selected from the various States. Their appointment should be suggested by Governors of States, land grant colleges, 4-H clubs, and other interested organizations. The method of designating these students is not at the moment important.

If this farm or game college or experimental station could be established within 50 miles of Washington, it could be made of great educational advantage. In the first place, every patriotic citizen who can afford the trip visits Washington at some time in his life, and, in the second place, the Capital City is nearly always included in tours of college students.

The proximity of the school would afford an opportunity for the 96 Senators and 435 Congressmen, members of congressional committees, and executive officials to visit it and visualize the practical work of replacement under scientific methods.

It would be readily accessible to the scientific staffs of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Commerce. It would undoubtedly stimulate renewed and popular interest in the subject of conservation. I believe that an Executive order could bring this about. Certainly it can be done by an act of Congress.

Regulations of the duck-stamp bill should be strictly enforced. The bill provides an opportunity for securing, in new applications, vital statistics regarding the "kill" of the previous season. In fact, it is the only exact method of ascertaining what actually happens. A new license should not be issued until the applicant has given the exact number of migratory birds killed by him during the preceding year.

This would assure some degree of accuracy in the ascertainment of the annual "kill", stop the absurd guessing which is going on, and forestall some of the foolish estimates that cannot possibly be based upon accurate reports.

It would further assist in revealing the true situation as to regional abundance or scarcity of migratory birds.

The statement has been made frequently by intelligent observers that in the four established lanes of migratory bird flights there are in some sections an abundance, in others a shortage, and in still others a dangerous shortage.

A record of the "kill" in the preceding year would do much to definitely establish the shortage or the supply.

I have watched the progress of this bill with keen interest, because it is what I might call "my baby", and I would like not only to see it become a source of income but also a method of securing exact knowledge in replacement of guess and conjecture.

Senate and House Committees on Wildlife Conservation have performed invaluable work, probably the best that has been given to our people, because their recommendations have been practical and have been written into law.

We may express the hope that both the special Senate and House committees shall be made permanent standing committees. The subject is sufficiently large, from the point of view of economics and public interest, to justify this action.

I make these few recommendations because they are easily effectuated if united effort is put behind them.

They represent by no means all that can be done nor all that should be done, but they are achievements which are within sight in perfecting Federal control.

THE STATE FACTOR

The State factor represents by far the largest portion of the problem. The Federal Government may point the way and give assistance through scientific research, but a coordination of the whole plan of conservation depends upon the intelligent activity of the States.

This brings a direct challenge to each Governor, to each legislature, and each unofficial organization.

While the total of Federal acreage is approximately 400,000,000, the State acreage is approximately 1,500,000,000. It is upon this vast State acreage that we find most of our upland game.

First in food and hunting value is the lowly rabbit—the young hunter's delight, and a choice morsel for the farmer's table—whose skin has a great fur value. Then come the deer, the quail, the grouse, the pheasant, the wild turkey, and a number of other birds and animals, all upland game, under State jurisdiction.

Game belongs to the States or, when on Federal property, to the Federal Government.

The State has the right to regulate the bag limits and seasons for shooting, and to impose these regulations in the exercise of its police power or what might be termed community interest. And these regulations are binding on the landowner or lessee of lands.

The first requisite, therefore, is proper administrative laws for each of the 48 States. Some States have excellent laws which require no revision. Many more certainly require a change in the manner of administration, and some are unquestionably bad.

Some 2 years ago a committee was organized to prepare a model State law for administrative purposes, and it is a pleasant thing to record that the legislatures of six States adopted, in whole or in part, our plan of administration, which is simple but effective.

My recommendations in the State field are:

Adopt the proposed model State administrative law. Urge its passage upon all candidates for Governor and candidates for legislatures. Some variation of the act may be required because of local conditions, but the fundamentals are sound, and it follows the thought of uniformity in State legislation now urged for all subjects. Remove politics from game and fish administration. Hunters and fishermen are neither Republicans nor Democrats; they are primarily sportsmen, and can be persuaded to disregard partisan lines and unite in removing game and fish management from political uses in both primaries and elections.

Establish new State game parks and sanctuaries. An increased acreage is necessary. Purchases can be made now while the land is cheap and submarginal land is on the market. One experimental station in each State is necessary; more than one are desirable.

State universities, colleges and public schools should promote the study of game and fish conservation. It greatly interests the student. They like the subject. They are what might be called the seed crop for future conservationists. What they require is not alone academic study but stimulation, assistance, and applause for work well done.

Financial assistance is necessary for instruction in land-grant colleges, in the 4-H clubs. The subject should be brought home also to the Boy Scout and the Girl Scout, the junior chambers of commerce, the chambers of commerce, to the farm organizations, the American Legion, and the Federation of Women's Clubs.

It can be made a topic of interesting and entertaining discussion for Kiwanis Clubs, Rotary Clubs, and kindred organizations. I cannot mention all.

State funds for the support of conservation, which come from the hunter and the fisherman, should not be diverted and used for any other purpose than conservation. Any attempt to divert their use for other purposes should be vigorously opposed.

The State program should be short, understandable, and not difficult to explain. We should stress its scenic and health advantages and by all means avoid the impractical in both legislation and administration.

THE FARMER FACTOR

The farmer and the landowner hold the key to the restoration of game. Without an understanding between the sportsman and the farmer, preservation and restoration cannot succeed.

The farmer must be convinced, and it can be done, that game is a valuable byproduct of the farm, and the sportsman must not expect the farmer to contribute to his pleasure without compensation.

The farmer has been put to expense and trouble to acquire what he has, and the sportsmen must expect to bear his part of the cost.

The farmer lives on the land. On his acreage there is or could be ample food and cover for upland game birds and many of our smaller animals.

He controls the latchstring to the hunting field, and his importance in the picture of wildlife restoration must not and cannot be overlooked.

No plan for the restoration of wildlife can be successful without the inclusion of the farmer as the first vital factor, and when this thought finally impresses the sportsman, the greatest hurdle in the wildlife restoration program will have been passed.

A new relationship must be established between the sportsman and the farmer which will carry with it mutual respect and co-operation characteristic of any other effective partnership.

When he is shown how, the farmer can make enough from game to at least pay his taxes. This has been done in many of the Southern States where shooting privileges are leased.

I am convinced that the future of game restoration depends upon the attitude of the farmer or landowner, who, with the sportsman, will bring about constructive legislation in game management for this purpose.

THE SPORTSMAN FACTOR

Sportsmen, hunters, and fishermen are the chief support of real wildlife conservation.

To those splendid men and women who know the law and observe it, advice and suggestions would be a gratuity.

Game, fish, and fowl are valuable as foods. There is no waste in the killing of these so long as the seed stock is preserved and replenished.

A man with a hunting license and a gun should not be permitted to cheat. Every time a hunter or a fisherman exceeds the bag limit he steals from his fellow sportsman; he does a dishonorable thing.

When the limit is 10 birds, and he takes 15, he steals 5 birds from his fellow sportsman; he violates the law and plays the game unfairly.

Other sportsmen should not tolerate him. A license should be considered a decoration, something worthy of pride. It should not be a device for evading or violating the law.

No man should attempt to hunt until he is thoroughly familiar with his gun and has practised with it.

I am convinced that cripples constitute a serious loss in game life, and I might add in fish life, such as the careless handling of undersized fish in returning them to the water.

Accuracy in shooting and the possession of a retriever dog will lessen the heavy toll of cripples.

To illustrate: We will suppose that the limitation is 10 birds, but in securing this limit the hunter wounded 5 others, which escape only to die later. This, in effect, has raised the hunter's limit to 15 birds instead of 10, even though the 5 which were crippled are lost to him.

He has done more than violate the law of ethics in hunting; he has not only killed 50 percent more than the bag limit, but he has been guilty of a serious actual waste of wildlife.

A real sportsman obeys Federal and State laws. If he does not approve regulations, or finds them too rigid, or, like the prohibition law, he considers them too extreme, he may exercise his American prerogative by asking for a change, but as long as the laws are on the statute books they must be observed.

By setting an example the sportsman can do much by his own conduct.

If he will give just a little time to the new hunters, the boys that are coming along, and instill in them a true spirit of sportsmanship, the work will be more than half done.

Sportsmen will find that State legislators, Congressmen, and United States Senators are, as a rule, good fellows, and if he will secure contact with them, or write to them giving his point of view, I am sure his letters will be acceptable and helpful.

For the sportsmen I would recommend the following:

1. Assist the farmer, cooperate with him, by advice and practical assistance in the preservation and restoration of game.
2. Join the most representative and practical sportsman's organization in his immediate vicinity, and be sure that this local organization has a contact with a national organization.
3. Become acquainted with the game warden. Do not hesitate to report violations of the law. It is not an unethical, despicable thing to do; be brave about it. You would report a thief, a counterfeiter, or an embezzler. Why should a game "outlaw" not be reported in the same way that other violators are reported? It is the right thing to do.
4. Appeal directly to the State representative and State senator from your district. Tell them of the necessity of a model State administrative law. Express an interest. Write a letter. It will be appreciated.
5. Communicate with the Governor of your State or the candidate for Governor. Let him know that you are watching and are interested. Do not suggest the impossible. Demand a few sensible things.

CONCLUDING

Concluding, it will be noted that I have omitted reference to the important subject of pollution, and have not had an opportunity to refer at length to game fish and the fisherman. It has been a disappointment to me that I have had to avoid these important subjects, but 15 minutes is too short a time in which to cover even one of them.

We must preserve our game fish, we must battle with the fish "hog" as we do with the game "hog." We must instill sportsmanship and respect for law.

We all know that 7,000,000 fishermen, who pay for conservation in their respective States, are nearly all hunters as well. Their problems are much the same.

State legislation and administrative laws are under one head, so that in discussing game and in making suggestions, all that I have said of hunters applies with equal force to the fisherman.

The division of powers between the Federal and State Governments is relatively the same, except that navigable streams are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Fishermen and hunters have the power; they ought to have the incentive. If they raise their voices we can bring back or restore that wildlife so essential to the health, the pleasure, and I believe fine patriotism for our citizens.

"A long pull, a strong pull, and a pull all together" should be our slogan for restoration of wildlife.

CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK], on the subject of National Wildlife Conservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address on the subject of Conservation of Wildlife Resources delivered by Hon. FRANK H. BUCK on February 7, 1936, over the National Broadcasting System:

We are today concluding the 5-day conference called by President Roosevelt for the purpose of developing a comprehensive program for the conservation and restoration of the Nation's wildlife resources.

To my own State, California, with its splendid heritage of wild birds and animals, its wonderful fishing, its great clubs of sportsmen, and its interest in nature, the developments that have taken place in this conference must be of prime importance. While everyone has known that many forms of wildlife were in grave danger and that hundreds of kinds of birds and animals were too scarce to supply our needs, either for sport or for study, for simple interest in observation, or for natural control of insects and other pests, still grave doubts have been held by many as to the possibility of concerted and effective action. Now that the conference is about over, it is easy to see that there is a real hope for future conservation of these birds and animals, and that the furnishing of future supplies of game can be put on an effective business basis. The only form of wildlife that the conference has reduced to the vanishing point is the wild tribe of doubters and critics, who are in real danger of becoming extinct.

Existing Federal, State, county, and private agencies have for many years past been doing important work in the cause of conservation, but there has been no effective cooperation, no nationwide planning undertaken which would even offset the forces of destruction. Increased population, increased cultivated area, increase in the number of hunters and fishers going forth each season, increased accessibility to mountainous regions, have all been part of these destructive forces. Inland streams have become polluted; mountain waters have been diverted for human consumption or for irrigation purposes, doing incalculable damage to aquatic life. Drainage has impaired, and in many cases destroyed, the natural refuges of migratory wild fowl.

It is no wonder, therefore, that those of us who have been interested in the advancement of the cause of conservation have been seriously concerned and have made efforts to promote not only legislation in the Halls of Congress but to aid and assist the executive departments and bureaus in every way possible to remedy the conditions that man has brought about which would ultimately destroy wildlife. Great opportunity exists not only in the work of the Bureau of Biological Survey, the Bureau of Fisheries, the Forest Service, and the National Park System but in the activities of the new agencies which have been created under the present administration. For example, the C. C. C. camps have devoted a great portion of their work to suppressing forest fires, building firebreaks, and planting trees over denuded areas. This forest work provides protection for the birds and animals that inhabit the forests and for the fish that dwell in the forest streams.

The Soil Conservation Service, which was made a permanent Bureau in the Department of Agriculture by Congress in 1935, is engaged now in 140 separate projects, affecting a total of 50,000,000 acres. Over 500 C. C. C. camps supply the labor. Farmers everywhere have shown their interest in this particular activity. They are signing soil-erosion agreements which undertake to avoid farming operations that will be detrimental to desirable forms of wildlife; to improve wildlife conditions generally; and to produce where possible an annual replacement of game and game fish as a means of providing supplemental compensation for land retired from cultivation through the operation of the soil-conservation program. Land retired in large tracts by this service may be developed into game refuges throughout the Nation.

The Special Committee on the Conservation of Wildlife, established by the House of Representatives on January 29, 1934, was created with a view to bring about progress toward some definite

goal of conservation. The Senate had previously established a similar committee and these two committees have been in close collaboration with each other. The House committee has been under the able leadership of Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, who has been indefatigable in his efforts to bring about proper consideration of wildlife problems. Although the committee has made effective inquiries into, and surveys of migratory fowl and upland game, its efforts have not been confined to those. Nearly one-half of its report filed with Congress on January 3, 1935, is devoted to conservation of fisheries in interior waters and conservation of commercial fisheries.

As a member of that committee since its establishment, I have been particularly interested in watching and helping the development of the cooperative spirit which has developed in Congress and which has been consummated now in this present conference. In order to understand the present situation, perhaps it will be well to consider some of the doubts that have beset many persons and see how they have been resolved.

First, there were the factional doubts: The sportsmen were afraid that the tender-hearted would get control and try to stop all shooting; while the tender-hearted were afraid that the sportsmen would get control and maybe open the season on songbirds. But there is no factional control. The individuals attending the conference have come from every section of the country, and they represent every school of thought. They have organized on an acting and temporary basis the General Wildlife Federation, and practically every group is represented in the temporary set-up. Unquestionably the same will be true of the final permanent organization. Moreover, even a pot hunter realizes that broad measures to conserve and restore streams and forests cannot but add to the game supply; and even the most ardent nature lover cannot fail to see that any measure to conserve and restore game cannot help doing the same for countless nongame species. Hitherto conservationists have dissipated their energies in fighting each other instead of uniting to fight together for the many things on which they all agree. It has been a main purpose of the conference to define and support everything that everyone agrees will help wildlife in general, and it has been a surprise to some to find how many good ideas others had when the fighting was stopped for a moment.

The next set of doubts was geographical. Easterners were afraid that the westerners would get control and dictate to them, and westerners were afraid of the easterners. These doubts had no foundation either. The function of the national organization which is proposed is not governing or regulatory, but cooperative and advisory. At the bottom of this structure will be local groups, including sportsmen's clubs, bird and nature societies, fish-planting clubs, and all other agencies interested in wildlife restoration. These will combine into county units, headed by a chairman; county groups will merge into a State federation; which in turn will become part of a regional set-up comprising some 13 regions. It is the hope and expectation of the leaders that it will be the State branches which will be the strongest and most independent parts of the whole—but of course that when truly national problems arise, as they do from time to time, the State organizations will give their advice, and if they feel it proper, their support.

Finally, there were political doubts of various kinds. People whose knowledge of politics and politicians had been gained largely from newspaper cartoons feared that these frightful monsters would run away with the meeting. Hard-working and harassed State and Federal officials feared that they would be deluged with impractical theories and lobbied at and against by wild-eyed men who talked a lot but didn't represent anybody. Authorities in several of the States, including my own, have been jealous of their own prerogatives and fearful that the Federal Government would pack the meeting and usurp the right and proper control of their own resources by the States. These doubts, too, have been removed. The Federal Government has no representation on the federation as organized. In a few cases Federal employees who are citizens of a given State have been drafted to act temporarily as State delegates, but only where there have not been enough private citizens to go round, and these men will turn over their duties to someone not connected with the Federal Government immediately upon their return to their several States. I sincerely hope that those States which have not seen fit to have their own fish and game authorities attend this conference will now realize that it is to the benefit of their own organizations and their own States to cooperate fully from this time on.

Further, the federation will not be a lobbying organization, and this has been made quite clear by Mr. Jay N. Darling, former Chief of the Bureau of Biological Survey, who has been chosen temporary president. Perhaps the best way to explain the function of the General Wildlife Federation is to take an imaginary situation and show how the federation would be expected to operate.

Suppose that in one of the counties of California, part of which is national forest, the deer suddenly begin to die from some unknown cause. The chairman of the county committee will get in immediate touch with the State committee and the State committee will see that the facts are laid before the best available biologist with no delay. In many cases, of course, it will be the State fish and game department that will have the best knowledge. In any case, within the shortest possible time the cause and cure of the disease will be found. Perhaps it is a dangerous epidemic, and the affected deer must be eliminated immediately

to save the rest in the State. Such action, perhaps, will require special legislation by the State and cooperation by the Forest Service. The State committee, knowing exactly what is needed and how to present it to the legislature, will do that (meanwhile arranging for the national committee to contact the Chief of Forest Service in Washington and explain the situation to him) and then notify, through the county chairmen, all the members in the State and advise them to tell their representatives in the legislature what they want.

Thus, with the common wishes of everyone interested in wildlife correlated and clarified quickly and accurately, a possible catastrophe might be turned into a local incident.

It remains, of course, to be seen whether strong State federations under alert and disinterested leadership can be formed to correlate the desires of their memberships with the scientific facts of nature, and make use of the national committee, the various Government agencies, and the political structure of our States and Nation to conserve and restore wildlife for the use and pleasure of everyone. The ideal is a high one, and even an approximation of it will be a great step in advance.

Let me say that though this ideal may be high the spirit shown by the conference encourages me to believe that we are at last going to accomplish something in securing public recognition of the needs and value of wildlife resources. This program is broader than just the restoration of wild birds and animals and the protection of fish, it involves the welfare of lands, forests, waters, and soils, and through protection of them the welfare of our future citizens and of all the people.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, I have had several inquiries from Members lately about the acquisition program of the Forestry Service. With the permission of the Members of the House, I should like to insert in the RECORD this morning, following my remarks, a statistical table showing the purchase units, the cost to date and the estimated cost of finishing the purchase of these various units. Also appearing will be the names of the Members of Congress in whose districts these forestry lands lie, so that if you are interested in the forest acquisition program you may look at the RECORD tomorrow and see what your unit has and what interest you may desire to take in obtaining additional funds when the appropriation bill comes up for consideration next week.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein these tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if he will state where we are going to get the funds with which to acquire these lands?

Mr. PARSONS. I may say to the gentleman that matter will be taken up at a later date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The tables referred to are as follows:

Distribution of purchase units by congressional districts

State	Congressman	Purchase units
Maine	Simon Moulton Hamlin	White Mountain.
Do.	Ralph O. Brewster	Grand Lake.
New Hampshire	William Nathaniel Rogers	White Mountain.
Do.	Charles William Tobey	Do.
Vermont	Charles Albert Plumley	Green Mountain.
Pennsylvania	Robert F. Rich	Allegheny.
Do.	D. J. Driscoll	Do.
West Virginia	Jennings Randolph	Monongahela.
Do.	Andrew Edmiston	Do.
Do.	John Kee	Do.
Virginia	A. Willis Robertson	Monongahela, George Washington.
Do.	Howard Worth Smith	George Washington.
Do.	Thomas G. Burch	Unaka, White Mountain.
Do.	Clifton Alexander Woodrum	Mountain Lake.
Do.	John W. Flannagan, Jr.	Unaka, Clinch, Mountain Lake.
Kentucky	Virgil Chapman	Cumberland.
Do.	Fred M. Vinson	Do.
Do.	John Marshall Robison	Do.
Tennessee	B. Carroll Reece	Unaka, Pisgah.
Do.	J. Will Taylor	Cherokee.
Do.	Sam D. McReynolds	Do.

Distribution of purchase units by congressional districts—Con.

State	Congressman	Purchase units
North Carolina	Robert L. Doughton	Unaka, Yadkin.
Do.	A. L. Bulwinkle	Unaka.
Do.	J. Walter Lambeth	Pisgah, Ucharie.
Do.	Zebulon Weaver	Pisgah, Cherokee, Nantahala.
Do.	Harold Dunbar Cooley	Ucharie.
Do.	Graham Arthur Barden	Croatan.
South Carolina	John Clarence Taylor	Nantahala, Enoree, Long Cane.
Do.	John J. McSwain	Enoree.
Do.	James Prioleau Richards	Do.
Do.	Thomas Sanders McMillan	Wambaw.
Georgia	B. Frank Whelchel	Nantahala, Cherokee.
Do.	Malcolm Connor Tarver	Cherokee.
Alabama	William B. Bankhead	Alabama.
Do.	Archibald Hill Carmichael	Do.
Do.	Frank William Boykin	Tombigbee.
Do.	Sam Hobbs	Talladega, Oakmulgee.
Do.	Joe Starnes	Talladega.
Do.	William Bacon Oliver	Oakmulgee.
Do.	Lister Hill	Conecuh.
Mississippi	Wall Doney	Holly Springs.
Do.	A. L. Ford	Do.
Do.	Aubert C. Dunn	Bienville.
Do.	William Myers Colmer	Chickasawhay, Leaf River, Biloxi.
Do.	Dan R. McGehee	Homochitto.
Do.	William Madison Whittington	Delta.
Louisiana	Cleveland Dear	Vernon, Kisatchie, Evangeline, Catahoula.
Texas	Martin Dies	Sabine, Angelina.
Do.	Nat Patton	San Jacinto, Davey Crockett.
Oklahoma	Wilburn Cartwright	Kiamichi.
Arkansas	Ben Cravens	Ouachita, Ozark.
Do.	Claude A. Fuller	Ozark.
Do.	David Dickson Terry	Ouachita, Ozark.
Do.	John L. McClellan	Ouachita.
Do.	John E. Miller	Ozark.
Missouri	Dewey Short	Gardner, Gasconade, Table Rock, Pond Fork.
Do.	Clyde Williams	Fristoe, Clark, St. Francois, Gasconade.
Do.	Orville Zimmerman	Fristoe, Wappapello.
Illinois	Claude V. Parsons	Shawnee.
Do.	Kent Ellsworth Keller	Illini.
Indiana	Arthur H. Greenwood	Patoka, Pleasant Run, Lost River.
Do.	John William Boehne, Jr.	Lafayette.
Do.	Eugene B. Crowe	Pleasant Run, Lost River, Patoka.
Ohio	James G. Polk	Little Scioto.
Do.	Thomas A. Jenkins	Symmes Creek, McArthur.
Do.	Robert Thompson Secrest	Muskingum.
Do.	Mell G. Underwood	Rocking Valley, McArthur.
Idaho	D. Worth Clark	Boise.
Iowa	Edward Clayton Eicher	Keosauqua.
Do.	Lloyd Thurston	Chequest, Grand River, Chariton.
Do.	Hubert Utterback	Chariton.
Michigan	Albert J. Engel	Manistee.
Do.	Fred L. Crawford	Do.
Do.	Roy Orchard Woodruff	Huron, Manistee.
Do.	Prentiss M. Brown	Marquette, Hiawatha.
Do.	Frank E. Hook	Ottawa, Gogebic.
Wisconsin	Gerald J. Boileau	Oconto.
Do.	George J. Schneider	Argonne, Oconto.
Do.	B. J. Gehrmann	Chequamegon, Mondeaux, Flambeau.
Minnesota	Harold Knutson	Chippewa.
Do.	William Alvin Pittenger	Superior, Mesaba.
Do.	Richard Thompson Buckler	Chippewa.
North Dakota	Usher L. Burdick	Souris, Sheyenne.
Do.	William Lemke	Do.
Puerto Rico	Santiago Iglesias	Toro Negro, Luquillo.
California	Clarence Frederick Lea	Redwood Purchase Units.
Do.	Bertrand Wesley Gearhart	Sequoia.
Utah	J. W. Robinson	Provo and Davis Counties.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN WHOSE DISTRICTS NEW UNITS OR ADDITIONS ARE RECOMMENDED BY THE REGIONAL FORESTER

North Carolina	J. Bayard Clark	Cape Fear.
Tennessee		
District 2	J. Will Taylor ¹	Chattanooga.
District 3	Sam D. McReynolds ¹	Chattanooga, Sand Mountain, Scottsboro.
District 4	John Ridley Mitchell	Scottsboro.
District 6	Clarence W. Turner	Duck River.
Alabama		
District 8	Archibald Hill Carmichael ¹	Duck River, Scottsboro.
District 7	William B. Bankhead ¹	Duck River.
District 5	Joe Starnes ¹	Sand Mountain.
Mississippi		
District 6	William Meyers Colmer ¹	Addition to Chickasawhay.
District 5	Aubert C. Dunn ¹	Addition to Bienville.
District 7	Dan R. McGehee ¹	Do.
Louisiana		
District 5	Riley Joseph Wilson	Addition to Catahoula.
District 8	Cleveland Dear ¹	Do.
California	Harry Lane Englebright	Diamond Springs.
Oregon	James W. Mott	Marys Peak, Cottage Grove.
Do.	Walter Marcus Pierce	Ochoco and Sisters.
Idaho	Compton I. White	Payette, Weiser.

¹ Congressman in whose districts are located established units.

Forest land acquisition under Weeks and Clarke-McNary laws by land exchange and by withdrawal from public domain

CURRENT LAND AND FINANCIAL STATUS OF ESTABLISHED PURCHASE UNITS, AS OF AUG. 29, 1935

Region and unit	State	Gross	Reserved public lands	Acquired through exchange	Purchased or in course of purchase	Average cost per acre	Total amount expended or obligated to date	Additional area to be purchased	Approximate cost to complete unit	Area believed to be nonpurchasable
		<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>			<i>Acres</i>		<i>Acres</i>
New England:										
Grand Lake	Maine	785,000						600,000	\$2,550,000	185,000
White Mountain	New Hampshire and Maine	859,795			707,804	\$7.65	\$5,412,792	105,991	727,590	46,000
Green Mountain	Vermont	593,908			160,143	10.52	1,685,361	338,265	2,924,767	95,500
Total		2,238,703			867,947	8.17	7,098,153	1,044,256	6,202,357	326,500
Appalachian:										
Allegheny	Pennsylvania	726,340	20	158	422,714	6.44	2,727,137	183,308	730,315	120,140
Monongahela	West Virginia and Virginia	1,727,088			824,356	3.33	2,749,103	564,202	1,430,612	338,530
George Washington	do	1,161,709		135	855,534	3.46	2,968,585	153,757	575,149	152,274
Mountain Lake	Virginia	1,977,516			202,307	2.26	458,409	1,029,309	3,775,920	745,900
Clinch	do	658,000			42,230	3.58	151,352	443,770	2,226,126	172,000
Cumberland	Kentucky	1,346,880			354,071	3.91	1,387,086	872,441	2,907,100	120,368
Unaka	Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee	1,503,700			335,180	3.77	1,264,114	1,078,370	3,775,151	90,150
Pisgah	North Carolina and Tennessee	1,154,840			435,001	5.39	2,345,249	606,116	2,965,307	113,723
Nantahala	Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina	1,550,900	8,394	70	466,501	6.28	2,932,752	942,290	3,855,326	133,645
Cherokee	Georgia, Tennessee, and North Carolina	1,765,600	4	14	621,901	4.45	2,770,692	1,080,511	4,262,547	63,170
Alabama	Alabama	561,065	17,709		137,686	4.73	651,710	340,330	1,361,499	65,340
Total		14,133,629	26,127	377	4,097,481	4.34	20,406,189	7,294,404	27,865,052	2,115,240
Piedmont:										
Uharie	North Carolina	560,000			24,180	5.31	128,442	437,794	1,274,520	98,026
Enoree	South Carolina	342,000			95,406	4.99	476,531	172,594	864,815	74,000
Long Cane	do	409,000			71,590	5.28	378,067	230,410	1,412,148	107,000
Total		1,311,000			191,176	5.14	983,040	840,798	3,551,483	279,026
Southern pine:										
Croatan	North Carolina	307,000			96,539	3.31	319,055	180,461	513,138	30,000
Wambaw	South Carolina	418,500			234,743	7.18	1,688,186	183,757	563,997	
Oseola	Florida	161,813	80		155,199	5.02	779,740	3,298	13,077	3,236
Ocala	do	478,981	158,689	189	84,591	2.80	236,781	211,897	419,033	23,615
Apalachicola	do	297,770			278,059	2.30	639,143	1,711	6,003	18,000
Choctawhatchee	do	368,048	133,635	55,931	111,805	2.44	272,584	17,812	24,345	48,865
Talladega	Alabama	422,000			123,940	2.03	252,048	222,060	1,072,309	76,000
Oakmulgee	do	282,000			44,130	3.03	133,675	209,870	755,325	28,000
Tombigbee	do	611,000						515,000	3,218,000	96,000
Conecuh	do	342,100			55,280	2.24	123,860	233,720	1,285,618	53,100
Holly Springs	Mississippi	530,520			97,079	3.77	366,188	102,921	289,851	330,520
Bienville	do	382,820			173,440	2.55	441,883	182,380	543,744	27,000
Chickasawhay	do	192,000			134,890	2.67	359,886	57,110	113,964	
Leaf River	do	623,261			231,737	2.08	481,846	336,524	750,885	55,000
Biloxi	do	409,600			127,720	5.26	671,422	192,040	769,042	89,840
Homochitto	do	412,469			188,010	3.39	636,508	153,159	540,085	71,300
Delta	do	323,840			13,344	55.00	733,920	261,496	502,860	49,000
Kisatchee	Louisiana	838,459			471,114	2.78	1,310,044	309,748	838,198	57,597
Vernon	do	107,500			80,746	1.43	115,682	112	1,637	26,642
Sabine	Texas	350,000			193,023	2.81	542,026	86,977	358,985	70,000
Angelina	do	300,000			131,283	2.72	357,152	138,717	485,554	30,000
San Jacinto	do	400,000			145,657	3.93	572,204	174,343	601,676	80,000
Davy Crockett	do	350,000			152,835	9.05	1,383,742	147,165	1,181,555	50,000
Total		8,909,681	292,404	56,120	3,325,164	3.73	12,417,575	3,922,278	14,848,911	1,313,715
Clark and central Mississippi:										
Ouachita	Arkansas and Oklahoma	2,476,576	628,077	32,945	650,842	2.31	1,506,446	898,052	2,271,607	266,660
Ozark	Arkansas	1,233,040	284,900		434,067	2.89	1,257,713	465,033	1,629,143	48,980
Table Rock	Missouri	247,420			30,589	2.62	80,300	156,831	388,250	60,000
Pond Fork	do	356,729			73,438	2.24	164,657	191,905	468,893	91,386
Gardner	do	269,796			68,195	2.73	186,240	156,917	469,867	44,684
Fristoe	do	466,655			252,420	1.96	494,149	133,022	343,907	81,213
Wappapello	do	347,592			98,650	2.14	210,845	188,230	524,664	60,712
Gasconade	do	469,364			93,006	2.24	210,070	272,194	748,884	103,564
Clark	do	704,469			306,131	2.02	617,755	260,652	662,774	137,686
St. Francois	do	451,680			40,494	2.12	85,985	321,186	727,795	90,000
Illini	Illinois	352,186			68,682	6.52	447,498	181,682	1,373,690	101,822
Shawnee	do	489,856			75,519	4.85	366,288	310,743	2,035,357	103,594
La Fayette	Indiana	201,320			13,154	8.19	107,678	146,686	931,282	41,480
Lost River	do	182,000			7,604	8.45	64,244	136,576	945,016	37,820
Patoka	do	209,000			6,565	7.77	51,019	159,735	1,113,081	42,700
Pleasant Run	do	189,000			7,979	8.74	69,724	134,021	924,276	47,000
Little Scioto	Ohio	287,000			16,508	6.44	106,252	219,492	2,725,748	51,000
McArthur	do	285,000			2,102	10.62	22,324	239,898	2,397,676	43,000
Hocking Valley	do	355,000			14,670	4.80	70,399	260,330	2,129,601	80,000
Muskingum	do	282,000						238,000	2,380,000	44,000
Symmes Creek	do	255,000			5,898	6.08	35,863	185,102	1,301,137	64,000
Total		10,110,683	913,037	32,945	2,267,113	2.72	6,155,449	5,256,287	26,492,638	1,641,301
Lake and upper Mississippi States:										
Keosauqua	Iowa	126,080						84,540	845,400	41,540
Chequest	do	244,040						154,400	1,544,000	89,640
Chariton	do	151,520						108,200	1,298,400	43,320
Grand River	do	307,360						225,220	2,702,640	82,140
Manistee	Michigan	1,282,847			190,689	2.62	499,763	982,316	2,413,737	109,842
Huron	do	579,992	137,512	128,672	154,767	1.88	291,243	37,918	151,087	121,123
Marquette	do	502,389	28,875	9,128	175,602	2.12	372,561	213,440	522,864	75,234
Hiawatha	do	675,843	2,634		362,989	2.30	836,820	145,237	411,843	164,983
Ottawa	do	1,738,553	320		487,722	3.32	1,728,471	1,035,008	11,722,367	215,503
Oconto	Wisconsin	444,194	483		229,515	2.02	465,785	104,252	283,181	109,944
Argonne	do	542,434	189		295,949	2.62	775,946	129,065	354,824	117,231
Fiambeau	do	333,768	245		131,968	1.62	214,403	2,864	11,339	218,701
Mondeaux	do	169,913	120		114,157	1.44	164,743	398	339	55,238
Chequamegon	do	578,342	750		423,734	1.81	768,435	12,665	27,155	141,193
Moquah	do	111,434	908		97,999	1.41	138,310	653	1,519	11,874

[Footnotes at end of table]

Forest land acquisition under Weeks and Clarke-McNary laws by land exchange and by withdrawal from public domain—Continued
CURRENT LAND AND FINANCIAL STATUS OF ESTABLISHED PURCHASE UNITS, AS OF AUG. 29, 1935—continued

Region and unit	State	Gross	Reserved public lands	Acquired through exchange	Purchased or in course of purchase	Average cost per acre	Total amount expended or obligated to date	Additional area to be purchased	Approximate cost to complete unit	Area believed to be non-purchasable
Lake and upper Mississippi States—Continued.		<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>			<i>Acres</i>		<i>Acres</i>
Superior	Minnesota	2,613,514	809,412	26,514	667,791	\$2.54	\$1,699,320	414,413	\$1,469,719	695,384
Mesaba	do	287,789	1,029		121,144	1.93	234,391	64,614	196,283	101,002
Chippewa	do	1,311,792	193,933		336,594	2.38	800,626	331,974	1,179,434	449,291
Souris	North Dakota	478,080			480	9.99	4,796	299,520	745,204	178,080
Shenandoah	do	293,760						200,000	600,000	93,760
Total		12,793,624	1,176,410	164,314	3,791,180	2.37	8,995,613	4,546,697	26,481,335	3,115,023
Utah:										
Provo		33,250						17,140	42,850	16,110
Davis County		58,200						49,149	147,447	9,051
Idaho: Arrowrock		142,000						30,000	106,500	112,000
California:										
Northern Redwood unit		262,000						132,660	4,560,000	129,340
Southern Redwood unit		580,000						268,400	4,494,000	311,600
Sequoia		1,928,411	1,331,631		21,133	17.39	367,534	561,116	3,553,195	14,531
Tahoe		51,613			51,613	2.00	103,226			
Total, Utah, Idaho, California		3,055,474	1,331,631		72,746	6.47	470,760	1,058,465	12,903,992	592,632
Puerto Rico: Caribbean		242,950	13,824		5,564	12.18	67,781	145,386	1,452,105	78,176
Total, region 4		233,450						96,289	296,797	137,161
Total, region 5		2,822,024	1,331,631		72,746	6.47	470,760	962,176	12,607,195	455,471
Total, region 7		10,079,177	13,844	293	3,574,723	4.91	17,607,606	4,436,429	19,299,684	2,053,883
Total, region 8		20,466,402	1,231,548	89,149	6,597,518	3.88	26,129,291	10,173,778	38,520,974	2,374,409
Total, region 9		19,194,691	1,176,410	164,314	4,973,384	2.42	12,386,903	8,439,899	49,073,223	4,440,684
Total, regions 4, 5, 7, 8, 9		52,795,744	3,753,433	253,756	15,218,371	3.71	56,594,560	24,108,571	119,797,873	9,461,613

¹ George Washington National Forest, includes George Washington and Natural Bridge units.

² Pisgah National Forest includes Pisgah, Yaddin, Boone, Mount Mitchell, and French Broad units.

³ Cherokee National Forest includes Cherokee and Georgia units.

⁴ Kisatchie National Forest includes Kisatchie, Evangeline and Catahoula units.

⁵ Ouachita National Forest, includes Ouachita and Kiamichi units.

Grand total purchased or in course of purchase \$15,428,902.09

Average cost per acre 3.06

Grand total amount expended or obligated to date 57,076,050.00

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a letter received this morning from Harold Lawson, president of the Richland County Farmers' Union—North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in explanation may I say I wish to include this letter in order to show the insidious method of lobbying which is all too prevalent in the United States today by organized minorities. This lobbying is harming the cause of the people for whom these movements are intended. Such threats create a bad impression upon any clear-thinking citizen. It is an attempt at back-seat driving by people who are not fully informed on the matter and an attempt to unduly coerce and threaten Members of the House. I believe such letters as this should be published in order to demonstrate to the country the harm which they are doing to the farmers of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

RICHLAND COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
Wahpeton, N. Dak., February 7, 1936.

Hon. CHARLES FADDIS,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FADDIS: Of all the efforts along the lines of farm relief made by the present administration, the work of the Farm Credit Administration, in what it has already accomplished, and in the possibilities it has for doing still greater good in the future, is by far the most effective and offers the greatest possibilities of success for the present administration. While we, as an organization, recognize the fact that the farmer must get better prices, and while we lament the Supreme Court decision concerning the A. A. A., we also recognize the fact that the solution of our problems by the cooperative method will take a long time. Therefore we not only comment to you the matter of lower interest rates, as is proposed by the Frazier-Lemke bill, but we demand that this legislation be passed immediately. In order to impress upon you still further the fact that we mean business, we propose to enlist the aid of every farm organization over the country to make the Frazier-Lemke bill their major legislative program. We suggest that you provide yourself with a special basket (not a waste-

basket) to receive correspondence and telegrams concerning this most serious matter.

We wish to further advise that we are making a study of the work of the Farm Credit Administration locally, and propose to have the farm organizations make such a study wherever the Farm Credit Administration is at work. The 1933 legislation, which did so much good, also established a monopolistic system of control over the Farm Credit Administration. Now, we are not living in Russia, nor Italy, nor Germany. We are free-born American citizens, who have finally awakened to the fact that we must fight for even a fair living in this land of plenty. We expect to get the Frazier-Lemke bill now or get it into the coming campaign, so as to give it the required airing in your district, as well as every other congressional district. This airing is to include the matter of how you voted. We trust that we can convince you "to get right."

Yours for real and immediate farm relief.

Respectfully submitted,

HAROLD LAWSON,
President, Richland County Farmers Union.

"LITTLE WATERS"—A BOOK REVIEW

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at the point just following the speech to be made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Sisson].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman is going to refer to any matter of interest to me in his extension of remarks in the RECORD, I think he would be fairer if he would let me know what he is going to say, so that I may have a chance to answer him.

Mr. MAVERICK. I shall be glad to submit a copy of my remarks to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. If necessary, I want a chance to reply.

Mr. MAVERICK. I will not do it unless the gentleman agrees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the majority leader if it is going to be the policy to have extensions of remarks appear in the body of the daily RECORD? This has never been the policy of the House, and I think it is a matter that ought to be determined before the Members ask for such right.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I agree with the gentleman from New York that it has not been the practice heretofore.

Mr. SNELL. I think it is a mistake to follow such a practice. I am willing that these gentlemen may extend their remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD, where such matter should be put.

Mr. MAVERICK. Let me make this explanation. What I have to say—

Mr. SNELL. If we do it for the gentleman from Texas, we will have to do it for every other Member who asks it.

Mr. MERRITT of New York. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MAVERICK. What I have to say will be pertinent to what has gone before.

Mr. SNELL. I think it is a matter that is up to the majority leader. I am willing to help him, but I am not going to take the responsibility myself.

Mr. MAVERICK. I shall withdraw the request if you want me to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will state to the gentleman that I think it is a matter that ought to be given serious consideration.

Mr. MAVERICK. I am willing to withdraw the request.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I am not going to object in this instance, but I think hereafter we ought to define some definite policy with reference to the matter, and I shall be very pleased to confer with the gentleman from New York about it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made on Abraham Lincoln by Cornelius A. Pugsley, of Peekskill, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address on Abraham Lincoln by Hon. Cornelius A. Pugsley, of Peekskill, N. Y., aboard the ship *Laconia*, at the Port of Hilo, in the Hawaiian Islands, on February 12, 1926, formerly a Member of Congress from the State of New York:

It seems eminently fitting that Americans sailing the mighty Pacific, after spending a day amid some of the loveliest islands that lie anchored in any ocean, and now belonging to the United States, that we should celebrate and commemorate the birth of that matchless American, Abraham Lincoln, whose name and fame are the common heritage of the American people; Lincoln who believed in and who came close to the great throbbing heart of the common people of his country. "Lincoln, who came from the plain people and heartily liked them, and we rejoice that in his lifetime he knew they returned the feeling with usury." Lincoln, who still lives in the hearts of his countrymen, and who stands forth as the typical American, comprehending within himself all the strength and gentleness, all the majesty and beauty of this Republic.

I love to think that when the Old World was tired of old conditions there crossed the Atlantic men of courage and of high ideals and sublime faith, who, facing afresh the problems of life, determined to reconstruct its institutions on a new foundation. It seemed to be given the builders of our Republic to look down the future and know that they were nation-building, founding institutions, setting in motion forces that should endure so long as men should fear God and love and treasure liberty and freedom. Great men were needed for the task and great men came forth, but they did not fall like shooting stars from the sky; they developed like the mighty oak on mountain side and in forest through years of sunshine and storm. Someone has said a thousand unrecorded patriots helped to make Washington, and we might add a thousand lovers of liberty and of equal rights for all men contributed to Lincoln, who preserved and extended the principles of liberty and freedom in our beloved land, for which the early builders hoped and fought and "gave the last full measure of devotion."

I love to think that through the indomitable spirit, courage, and westward yearning of our fathers, that in about two centuries our mighty Republic forced its way from Plymouth Rock to the Golden Gate and into the sunset sea, fulfilling the dream and the prophetic vision of Daniel Webster when he said: "There is nothing to check this people until they touch the shores of the Pacific, and then they are so much accustomed to water that that is a facility and no obstruction." We need to remember that terse

saying of Edmund Burke, "Big empires and little men go ill together." Lincoln stands forth preeminently in our Republic's life and in our Nation's history as one of our great master builders.

Sixty-five years ago yesterday Lincoln left his home in Springfield, Ill., on his memorable journey to the Nation's Capitol. He was then in the prime of life, within a day of 52 years of age. In Philadelphia, so rich in historic memories, he spoke to the assembled multitude at Independence Hall; referring to the great principle of liberty which had been enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, "which gave liberty to this country and hope to the whole world", he said, "If this country cannot be saved without giving up that principle, I would rather be assassinated on this spot than to surrender it."

Well may we rejoice that for every great hour the great man is born. In every crisis of our Nation's life, in every hour of need, forth from the loins of our Republic's life has sprung every son of strength and power she needed. To 1776 came Washington, to 1861 came Lincoln. Born in poverty he touched life at every point. He heard its minor chords when his much-loved mother was laid to rest amid the solitude of the wilderness, and when the sorrow, distress and burden of a mighty Nation fell full upon him. But he heard its major, its swelling triumphant tones in a world's acclaim, in the gratitude of a race redeemed from slavery, and when the angel of peace and the angel of death both came and the music of earth was drowned in the music of heaven.

Pascal, that eloquent master of sentences, said: "Man is the feeblest branch of the universe, but he is the branch that thinks." Brain power gives a crown where fortune has denied it; brain power invests man with royalty. Who of us do not love to recall an American boy, plowing alone or splitting rails, who in the loneliness of his occupation revolves over in his mind the contents of the few books he has read and becomes a thinker. A wonderful vista of possibilities opens before him; the flame of ambition is fired. The furrow is plowed straighter, the rails split with greater energy, and behold, a Lincoln who stood for freedom as Washington stood for independence, whose teachers were his mother's Bible, the silent forest, the lonely prairie, the swift-moving river, and the voiceless stars.

Well, as one said: "Give me the hut that is small enough, the poverty that is deep enough, and the love that is great enough, and out of them I will raise the best there is in human character."

It is said that framed and hanging upon the wall of Oxford College, England, as a sample of the finest and purest English in the world, is Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, the product of this child of the wilderness, who never studied within college walls, but whom, I believe, stimulated and inspired by supreme crises and events, rose from height to height until at Gettysburg, and in his second inaugural address, he caught the thrilling majesty tones of the old prophets of Israel and of Israel's sweet singer, David.

Lincoln stands forth as the model American, fulfilling the vision so beautifully pictured of the great masterful American by one of the great orators of this country when he said: "He will have the strong brain of the German, the polished manner of the French, the artistic taste of the Italian, the staunch heart of the English, the steadfast piety of the Scotch, the lightning wit of the Irish, and when he steps forth, bone, muscle, nerve, brain, entwined with the fiber of all nationalities, then shall the nations of the world break forth with the cry, 'Behold the American!'"

Lincoln lived to clutch the golden keys
And shape the whisper of a throne;
And mounting up from high to higher,
Became on Fortune's crowning slope
The pillar of a people's hope,
The center of a world's desire.

LAKE MEAD

Mr. STUBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUBBS. Mr. Speaker, no more appropriate honor could have been paid to Dr. Elwood Mead, the late great Commissioner of Reclamation, than that bestowed by giving his name to the lake formed by construction of Boulder Dam.

Lake Mead is one of the large lakes of the West. It is the world's largest artificial body of water and is unrivaled in scenic wonders. But even more important, Lake Mead, through the storage of the waters of the Colorado River for use by the people of the cities and farms in the southwest, plays a vital part in lives of millions.

Lake Mead epitomizes the life work of Dr. Mead, who supervised the construction of the dam which forms it.

I am sure that the people of the arid and semiarid regions of the West will join with me in acclaiming the action of the Board of Geographic Names of the Interior Department on the thoughtfulness of the tribute to Dr. Mead.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point the report that was made by the Board of Geographic Names of the Interior Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Secretary Harold L. Ickes, in announcing the action of the Board of Geographic Names, said, "It is altogether appropriate that this great, new geographical feature of the West should bear the name of Dr. Mead. He supervised the construction of Boulder Dam and he first envisioned the lake as a fine new playground dedicated to the benefit and pleasure of the people of the Nation. It is a fitting tribute to his large part in the development of the arid West."

The official designation by the Board of Geographic Names is as follows:

"Lake Mead: An artificial lake in Mojave County, Ariz., and Clark County, Nev., formed by damming the Colorado River in Upper Black Canyon. Named in honor of Dr. Elwood Mead (born Jan. 16, 1858, died Jan. 26, 1936), Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, 1924-1936, under whose supervision the dam that impounds the lake was built."

Lake Mead began forming February 1, 1935, when the gates of the diversion tunnels at Boulder Dam were closed. It caught the spring flood on the Colorado River last year and today contains approximately 4,000,000 acre-feet of water, being more than 82 miles long.

At capacity Lake Mead will reach 115 miles up the Colorado River, through Boulder Canyon, Virgin Canyon, Iceberg Canyon, and Travertine Canyon, and into the lower end of Grand Canyon. It will broaden to a maximum distance of 40 miles. It then will contain 30,500,000 acre-feet of water, or about 80,000 gallons for every person in the United States, and will cover 146,500 acres, or 229 square miles.

Lake Mead is the most important body of water in a vast territory adjacent to it on the map. It is the safety valve on the Colorado River. In it is held that stream's dangerous floods, and from it flows water stored for use by millions in Arizona and California in cities and on farms during the late summer, fall, and winter, when the natural flow of the river is insufficient for their needs.

The large capacity of the lake has been allocated as follows to its various uses: 9,500,000 acre-feet for flood control; 5,000,000 to 8,000,000 acre-feet for a silt pocket; 12,000,000 to 15,000,000 acre-feet active or regulation storage.

Lake Mead will be under the joint supervision of the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service. The Bureau will regulate the outflow of the water in conformity with the purposes for which Boulder Dam was built—flood control, improvement of navigation, regulation of the lower river in behalf of irrigators in the Palo Verde, Yuma, and Imperial Valleys and in behalf of domestic water users in the cities of southern California, and for generation of power. The National Park Service will have charge of the recreational facilities on the lake.

The scenic shores of Lake Mead, formed as they are by the towering cliffs of the canyons of the Colorado, are destined to prove a major tourist attraction in the Southwest. The lake will be stocked with game fish.

Dr. Mead said, in advocating the development of the recreational features of the lake, that he believed as many as 500,000 people annually would eventually visit it to see the magnificent vistas and to fish and bathe in its clear waters.

Because of Dr. Mead's outstanding work in the development of the Boulder Canyon project, the Department of the Interior received many suggestions from the West during the Commissioner's life that the lake be named in his honor. These suggestions were not adopted at that time, because the broad policy of the Department under Secretary Ickes does not permit the use of names of living persons in this manner. Until today the lake was unnamed.

LOANS TO FARMERS FOR CROP PRODUCTION AND HARVESTING

Mr. JONES submitted a conference report on the bill (S. 3612) to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1936, and for other purposes.

APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact we have passed three appropriation bills and now have under consideration the fourth appropriation bill. Every one of these measures has carried an increased appropriation over last year's appropriation. The majority leader said yesterday he hoped to pass the appropriation bills and adjourn. I should like to know from the majority leader and the membership of the House what arrangement they are going to make to take care of these appropriations. The responsibility of making these appropriations rests upon the Democratic Party in power and Members of the Congress.

You say you are going to balance the Budget. Your Democratic platform calls for it, and so does the Republican, but we are getting further and further away from balancing the Budget every day. We are squandering money recklessly.

This is the most serious question confronting the Nation today. We are building on sand, and we are going to fall if we do not do something to stop this spending. Where are you going to get the money?

[Here the gavel fell.]

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of such business as may be on the Speaker's table, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] may have 20 minutes to speak on the life, character, and public service of Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, of course, to this request, but I feel I ought to give notice that I shall be compelled to object to any further unanimous-consent requests to speak tomorrow after the reading of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADMISSION OF THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. EKWALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, February 14, which is the anniversary of the admission of the great State of Oregon into the Union, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to proceed for 15 minutes or less to tell the gentlemen and ladies of the House about the greatest State of the Union, in my estimation.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I should like to know if the gentleman is going to include some words of praise and commendation of the great Governor of the State of Oregon.

Mr. EKWALL. I am.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I may say to the membership of the House that we are hoping to be able to complete the consideration of the Army bill Friday regardless of how much time it may take us to do so. I do not want to object to these requests, but it is going to mean that we will have to go that much farther into the night if we are to complete the consideration of the bill. We are going to try not to adjourn Friday until the bill is passed, and I am making this statement to the membership for the purpose of stating that you may have to stay here later Friday to make up for such time as you may take up on matters not connected with the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order there is not a quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Sisson] for 10 minutes.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] on two occasions during the past week has taken the floor to make some remarks to admonish and reprove me, and to indicate that, in general, he did not approve of me.

The immediate cause of the gentleman's grief appears to have been an address that I made at a meeting at the Cosmos Club in this city on Monday evening of last week. The subject on which I was invited to speak was the coercion of teachers and the suppression of academic freedom.

Among the other speakers on the same occasion were Dr. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education; Mr. Aubrey Williams, the head of the National Youth Administration; and Mrs. Doyle, the president of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia. Numbered among the guests were members of the faculty of several colleges and universities, including the president of the Wilson Teachers' College, representatives of parent-teachers associations and civic groups, and a considerable number of Members of Congress. The expressions of opinion at this meeting were free and outspoken, and I think that it is not an overstatement on my part that practically everyone present agreed with what I had to say and with my purpose in saying it.

The request had been made of me by several of the educational and civic organizations that I should discuss the law passed last year as a rider to the District appropriation bill, which forbids the teaching of communism in the schools of the District of Columbia; and that I also state the reasons which led me to introduce at this session a bill repealing the provision forbidding such teaching.

I did this in a talk which took probably 20 or 25 minutes. My entire speech was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the courtesy of my friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Young] on February 6, and appears in the RECORD at pages 1699-1700. I shall not, therefore, rehash it here, but I should be glad if all of the Members of the House who are interested would read it, not only for the purpose of determining whether I violated any rule of fair play, so far as the gentleman from Texas is concerned, but also for the information which it furnishes as to the dangerous character of this law forbidding the teaching of communism in the District of Columbia, and the method which was used in slipping this important legislation through in such a manner as to escape the study, scrutiny, and open discussion which most of the Members on both sides of this House mean to have given to important legislation.

I did not, as the RECORD will show, mention the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] by name. Perhaps that is one of the things which irritated him. However, I had no grievance against him and I did not think it important. It is likely, however, that from my discussion of the dangerous and vicious character of this law, and the unfair method used to pass it, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] might have been readily identified as the Member mainly responsible for both the character of the legislation and the way in which it was passed.

Thereafter, and on Wednesday of last week, and after notifying me that he intended to do so, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] took the floor to reply to me.

After admitting, as usual, the purity of his own motives and the fairness which always characterizes him, he proceeded to reply to me by emphasizing the fact that I had been here only two terms and that if I would spend more time on the floor I would learn more about the rules and become a better parliamentarian. He then devoted the rest of his time to an attack upon some of the many newspapers and editorial writers who have on one occasion or another indicated that they do not entirely admire or respect the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

I read the gentleman's remarks in the RECORD the morning after he made them; and as the gentleman's perennial discontent over the lack of esteem which all of the newspapers here—except the Hearst papers—have from time to time manifested for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]—and as I certainly cannot violently quarrel with any of the said newspapers because it is no quarrel of mine—I decided that there was nothing in the gentleman's remarks to warrant my taking either my own time or the time of the House in replying to him.

However, although the gentleman had 20 minutes of the time of the House on Wednesday to reply to me, he absolutely failed to discuss the merits of this law coercing teachers and suppressing academic freedom for which he was responsible and totally neglected to discuss the question as to whether this was an open and straightforward method to legislate, but devoted the whole time to personalities

rather than the merits. Then, on Friday of this week, he again took occasion to manifest the fairness for which he has so long been noted and to use his unequaled powers of sarcasm by asking if I had been consulted about certain legislation which was then under discussion and by making further remarks to attempt to imply that as I was absent from the floor at that time that I was not attending to my legislative duties.

I still do not think there is anything in the gentleman's remarks which would cause me very much sleeplessness, and I would not take the time of the House to reply except for the fact that the many people who desire the repeal of this legislation have indicated to me that they do not wish this body to get the impression that there is any large public approval of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] for getting this law onto our statute books or for his efforts to retain it there. I hope, therefore, that the Members of the House will look up this law and the method by which it was passed and will make some investigation as to its effects in the schools of the District of Columbia. I do not know of anyone who has made any public statement about this matter—either the educational or civic associations or any of the newspapers that agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] about this law, with the possible exception of the Hearst papers.

The gentleman spent considerable time in telling how fair he was in this matter. Well, although I have been in Congress only two terms, I have been here long enough to know what brand of fairness to expect from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The meeting of the Cosmos Club was an open meeting, attended by the press and by a large number of men and women who have given many years to educational and civic service and who are interested in the welfare of boys and girls. I criticized the law and I criticized the method by which the law was passed. The gentleman from Texas has not made any reply on either of these grounds. He showed his fairness, first, by lifting a couple of sentences out of my address, out of their context, but otherwise not discussing the issues at all. He showed his fairness by attacking the Washington Post and claiming the Post had made a false statement about him, but he did not say wherein the statement was false. He showed his fairness by attacking Mr. Noyes, of the Washington Star, and ascribing to him an improper motive on another matter, namely, that he wanted to avoid taxation.

He showed his fairness in one of his other statements by attacking the Washington News and referring to it as a "damnable lying sheet." Any man in public life—even a Member of Congress—is bound to be subjected to criticism, whether on the floor of Congress or otherwise, publicly or privately. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is the only Member of Congress I know that will not take such criticism standing up; but when he is criticized, or any measure which he has slipped in, as he did in this case, is criticized, does he meet the issue by talking about the merits of the particular law? No. He immediately resorts to personalities and uses his congressional immunity to attack men like Mr. Noyes and to attack educators such as Dr. Charters on the floor of the House of Representatives where he is safe by reason of his congressional immunity and where they cannot reach him. Last year he violently attacked Hon. Edward Keating, former Member of this House and now the editor and publisher of Labor, because the editor criticized him for blocking and preventing a vote on old-age pensions for the District of Columbia. However, the editor of a newspaper cannot reply to the gentleman in kind with his kind of fairness, because the newspaper could be sued for libel. It is not protected by the immunity by which the gentleman from Texas is protected and to which he so frequently resorts. His kind of fairness is about the same as striking another man when he is blindfolded and has his hands tied behind his back.

It is entirely true, and I plead guilty to it, that I have been a Member of Congress for only two terms. It is also true, and I plead guilty to that, that I am not as good a

parliamentarian as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. However, in my comparatively brief service in this House, I have managed to acquire some working knowledge of the rules and also, as is the case with most of the Members on both sides of this House, I had, when I came here, at least some elementary idea of the rules of fairness and of decency. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], of course, has had a long and varied experience in determining just how far he can skate on thin ice and not go through into the water, as the records of this House show. I do not believe it will be necessary for me to sit at the feet of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] in order to learn how to avoid the censure of the House for violation of the rules of decency or the condemnation of gentlemen for violating good sportsmanship and fair play.

It is also true, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] says, that on the occasion when the so-called "red rider" was passed, I was not on the floor. It is also true that the overwhelming majority of the other Members of the House, on both sides of the House, were not on the floor at that time. The gentleman from Texas has made a great study of the rules. Therefore, he knows what even newer Members of the House than myself know, that permanent legislation on an appropriation bill is improper and would be subject to a point of order. Of course, the gentleman knew this. Does he now want to resort to the defense that because there was no one present who saw the "nigger in the woodpile", that it was fairness for him to put over this important provision of substantive law in an appropriation bill where it would escape the study and discussion and scrutiny which the majority of Members on both sides of the House want to have it subjected to?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PARKS. Reserving the right to object, and I never have objected to a man having sufficient time, but I do think that Members should appreciate the fact that we ought to proceed with this appropriation bill. I will not object to this extension, but I hope the gentleman will conclude in that time, and I will not object to an additional 5 minutes for the gentleman from Texas if he wishes it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to an additional 5 minutes for the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I am not on the floor of the House every minute of every session. I have not even been on the floor of the House every minute when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is speaking and taking up more of the time of the House, and incidentally costing the taxpayers of this country more money for printing his statements about his extreme fairness, his superhonesty, and his value as a watchdog over the District of Columbia, and over the Treasury than any other five Members of the House. Like most of the Members of this House I find it necessary at times to serve in committee meetings and to visit departments in the interests of my constituents and my other congressional work, for which I was sent here—and at times when the House is in session. Even at that, sometimes this time is more profitably spent than it would be if I were on the floor of the House listening to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. Also, being a comparatively new Member, I have to spend a considerable amount of time studying legislation and cannot spend all of my time on the floor, either listening to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] or endeavoring to talk myself.

The gentleman said nothing about the merits of this legislation, this un-American law which is a suppression of free speech and of academic freedom and a coercion of the teachers of the District of Columbia. What is the effect upon teachers and upon the boys and girls in the schools of the District? Why, the effect is just exactly the same, so far

as the boys and girls are concerned, as everyone who knows anything about child psychology, as anyone who knows anything about our boys and girls, knows would inevitably happen. Instead of leading the boys and girls to believe that communism is opposed to our economic, social, and political system in America, it has a tendency to produce the opposite effect. It is invested with a magical, mystery air which inevitably leads the average boy and girl to go and find communistic meetings and communistic organizations to find out what it is all about. [Applause.] The teachers are required to sign a statement every month before they get their pay check that they have not taught communism in the schools of the District or anywhere else. The result is that a majority of them, although the ruling of the courageous Corporation Counsel has been otherwise, ban all mention of the political, economic, or social system prevailing in Russia or anywhere else where they understand it to be tainted with communism. The chapters of the textbooks in geography, history, civics, and allied subjects are skipped over when they come to Russia. One instance was noted—although probably this is an extreme illustration—where the teacher in physiology taught that the blood was a fluid in the body made up of white corpuscles and "the other kind." I hope that the Members of Congress have enough of the red corpuscles in their blood to see to it that this evil, un-American thing is forever driven out of the public schools.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has had a good deal to say about our beloved colleague from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] in an attempt to make you believe that Mr. CANNON agrees with him. I have a great deal of respect and admiration for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and I note that he is reported in one of the newspapers as stating this:

I am unalterably opposed to the teaching of communism in the public schools as a separate or special course of study. I am just as strongly in favor of its being taught in the regular courses, where it would be discussed, namely, in history, civics, and philosophy. * * * It is a mistake on the part of those opposing the teaching of communism, for the reason that, being denied a knowledge in the schools, the child will come to have heightened interest in the subject and will go out to inquire and listen to soap-box harangues. He will thus get his information from irresponsible fanatics and get the wrong idea. It is a safeguard to have it taught from authorized textbooks which have been approved by the educational authorities and by teachers who are trained to teach in the community. The child should get its information from authorized and supervised courses rather than from street-corner discussions and so-called "workers' literature."

I agree with that statement.

However, the inclusion of the word "teaching" in the so-called "red rider" has, as I have already indicated, caused a great many of the teachers in the District of Columbia to ban all discussion of communism in all of the subjects which they teach, and it has multiplied manifold the curiosity of the boys and girls in the subject itself, and led them, just as Mr. CANNON has pointed out, to get their information from bootleg sources.

Corporation Counsel Prettyman took a very courageous position and held that teachers should not be deprived of their pay if they had told the facts about communism in a proper way, but this has not cured the evil caused by this foolish law.

I wonder if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] in the time that he is going to devote to replying to me, will get close enough finally to the merits of the real question to tell us whether he agrees with the ruling of Corporation Counsel Prettyman. As indicating to the House the attention which this has attracted and the state of public opinion upon the question, I want to incorporate in the RECORD a partial list of organizations which are opposing the so-called "red rider" which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has espoused and has put over—and urging its repeal:

Southwest Citizens' Association; Burleigh Citizens' Association; Kalorama Citizens' Association; the Central Labor Union (102,000 members); the Teachers' Union of the District of Columbia; Education Association of the District of Columbia (1,400 members among public-school teachers and principals); the Washington Branch of the American Association of University Women (1,000

members); the Voteless District of Columbia League of Women Voters (360 members); the Citizens' Forum of Columbia Heights; the Francis Scott Key Parent-Teachers' Association.

I further call your attention to a resolution passed on this subject by the Washington Central Labor Union, representing 102,000 members of organized labor of the District of Columbia. This resolution unanimously backed the school board in its stand on teaching the facts of communism.

Backing of the school board also included a recommendation that the central body instruct its legislative committee to oppose in Congress any legislative control of the course of study in District public schools.

The resolution read, in part, as follows:

In the current District appropriation bill there was attached a rider through which the Congress is assuming to legislate on the facts which shall be taught in our schools, and is further attempting by act of Congress to establish details of educational administration and policy, a power which rightfully belongs to the Board of Education. * * *

The Central Labor Union believes that the democratic ideals of a country can best be served through an honest, full, uncensored discussion of political events.

In other words, the Central Labor Union recommends that the law forbidding the teaching of communism should be repealed.

And again I hope that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], will not again attempt to get away from the real issue by singling out some other people to attack or by attempting to laugh this off, but will tell us whether he has anyone agreeing with him in opposition to these educational and civic organizations and to the leading educators of the country, other than Mr. Hearst and the Hearst newspapers.

In conclusion, I wish to say that inasmuch as my duties to my constituents require me to devote some of my time to other congressional matters, that I do not intend to engage in any further discussion with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], either in reply to any personal attacks that he may make upon me, except insofar as may be necessary to secure the purpose to which I am devoted of ridding the statute books of this obnoxious piece of legislation and of freeing Congress from the approbrium of having passed such an un-American thing. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The SPEAKER. Under a special order, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] for 10 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I never start a fight and I never run away from one and I do all of my fighting standing up.

I did not start this fight. Several weeks ago the Washington Post reported the gentleman from New York [Mr. Sisson] as stating that Mr. CANNON and Mr. BLANTON had in "a cowardly way slipped through Congress" a rider to stop the teaching of communism in the schools.

Immediately I wrote a letter to Mr. Sisson and asked him if he made that statement. I did not get any reply. Then I called him up over the telephone and asked him if he had been quoted correctly by the Post, and if he claimed that Mr. CANNON and I had cowardly slipped such a rider through Congress. He denied it. He said he did not make any such statement, but that the Post had misquoted him. I said, "Well and good." It ended there with me. I attributed it to the well-known malice of the Post and not to him.

Then later he made his speech before the Cosmos Club, I not being there, and the Post again quoted Mr. Sisson as saying that in an improper way Mr. BLANTON had slipped through Congress the rider that stopped communism in the Washington schools, and made some references to me to which I took exception. I notified Mr. Sisson again personally. I did not slip down town before some club, in his absence, and make a speech about him, referring to him in an uncomplimentary manner, or cause uncomplimentary reports to be made about him in the newspaper as he did. I took the matter up with him personally after he had failed to make the newspaper correct it. That is my way of doing things. If I ever have anything to say uncomplimentary about one of my colleagues I shall come

to him and say it in person, face to face. That is the 20 years' reputation I have in this House I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Sisson]. I notified him personally that I was going to answer him and wanted him to be present.

I called him up over the telephone in person and said, "Mr. Sisson, I am going to discuss the report of your speech. This is the second time you have had occasion to refer to me, and I am going to discuss you on the floor, and I want you to be present and hear what I have to say." Was not that fair? Is not that the kind of method that you would have used? But he did not come. He remained away. That is the only time I have ever referred to the gentleman from New York being absent from this floor. I never refer to the absence of any colleague. I had a right to tell you when speaking about him that I notified him to come, did I not? You will not find in the RECORD what the gentleman claims I said the other day about asking the gentleman from Virginia whether or not he had conferred with the gentleman from New York, for the RECORD will show that I did not mention the gentleman's absence. I did not say that he was not here. I made no reference to his being absent. I merely said, "Has the gentleman referred this matter to the gentleman from New York and another gentleman, who claim they do not want these riders put on appropriation bills, indicating that they were going to be alert hereafter and be on this floor and stop it." That is what the other gentleman said—they were going to be alert; that they had learned they had to watch to keep riders from going on appropriation bills. I had a right to say that facetiously, and I think, since the gentleman from New York claimed riders are not passed properly, we should find out whether or not he had been consulted about the riders Mr. WOODRUM was then passing in the House by unanimous consent.

If you gentlemen will look at the RECORD for June 6, 1935, you will see where our chairman, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, who is a splendid gentleman and whose reputation in every particular will match that of our friend from New York, appeared on this floor with a conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill and told the House that there was a piece of legislation in it that had to be voted on.

He had the Clerk read that amendment from the Clerk's desk on the floor of this House, which amendment provided that hereafter no part of the money appropriated should be paid to any teacher who teaches or advocates communism in the public schools. That was read aloud by the Clerk of this House, and voted upon, and passed unanimously.

That was the time for the gentleman from New York [Mr. Sisson], exercising his Representative duty, if he did not like that amendment, to rise in his place and say, "Hold on, I do not like it, I do not want you to pass it, I vote against it, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present, I want the entire 435 Members here." But he did not do it. He says he was not here. Why was he not here? Whose fault was it? I repeat that amendment was read from that Clerk's desk by the Clerk. The House voted on it. The House passed it without a single objection being raised against it.

Do we have to sneak over to the House office, or around town, to hunt for the gentleman from New York and look him up and tell him about everything that is going to be done on the floor of the House with respect to legislation before we can pass it? Is that the plan that is to be adopted, that we would have to take it up with him in his private office or elsewhere and say, "We are going to take this and that up today; the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] has two important riders that he has put on an appropriation bill and the Senate has agreed to them and will not let the bill pass if we do not pass these riders. Please let us pass them." Would that procedure not be ridiculous?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MAY. If the gentleman from New York had been in the Chamber at the time when that amendment was pro-

posed, he could have made the point of order and stopped it. It would have been subject to a point of order as legislation on an appropriation bill, and therefore, subject to be thrown out.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman says he was not here; and because the House passed it during his absence, and the contention he makes is that it was slipped by him. Does not he know that we have a Speaker in the chair who requires the House to pass legislation in the orderly manner and in accord with the rules and precedents of Congress? Does he not realize that if he were correct in saying that it was slipped over on the House, when it was read by the Clerk and voted upon by the House, that he is convicting every Member then present of being asleep, of not being watchful, of being negligent, of not attending to their duties, and of being inefficient?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I was on the floor of this House all the time. About 40 or 50 Members were here, and never before did I hear Tom BLANTON speak in a muffled tone so that no one could know what it was. The Clerk was not understood, because I was here and I would have objected. I know what a point of order is. I know what legislation in an appropriation bill is; that it is improper and subject to a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. O Mr. Speaker, that is all nonsense. Tom BLANTON was not even speaking. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] made the motion to adopt the rider, and it was read by the Clerk from the desk in front of the Speaker.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Yes. You and Mr. CANNON were right there [pointing].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, is there any way to stop this obstreperousness? [Laughter.] Mr. Speaker, that motion to adopt the rider I had the conferees to agree to, stopping communism in the Washington schools, was made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who moved to recede from the amendment of the Senate and concur with this anticommunism amendment, which amendment he had the Clerk read aloud to the House. That was Mr. CANNON talking and our Clerk reading. It was Mr. CANNON's motion, not mine. The gentleman from Washington must be ———. [Laughter.]

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield right there? If not, I rise to the privilege of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will go and sit down in his place, I may yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. All right. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield for a proper question.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. When I made the statement, I did not say the gentleman from Texas made the motion, but the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] were there [pointing] and you stood right alongside him, and in muffled tones told him what to do. Mr. CANNON made that motion. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman knows all that, he must have known about the motion to adopt the rider to stop communism. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further. That contention is just as asinine and ridiculous as every other statement the gentleman has made.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I do not yield further.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the words be taken down; then the gentleman will have to yield.

The SPEAKER. What are the words of which the gentleman complains?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. That I was doped; that I am an ass or asinine, and a few other things like that. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the request comes too late.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Does the Chair mean the reference to my being doped?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman take it out?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, sure.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. All right.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, does anybody think for a minute he is going to tell the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] what to do or how to do it? He is the greatest parliamentarian in the United States. He is the author of one of the greatest works on parliamentary precedents that has ever been produced, about a dozen large volumes of which are on the press now.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. We know about that.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course; the statement is ridiculous. I repeat, it is asinine to contend that anyone must tell the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] what to do here or how to do it—it is asinine.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down. What does "asinine" mean? I forget. I ask that the words be taken down. I make the point of order on the basis of privilege and ask that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire the words to be taken down?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Yes; I do for a while; I want to find out what it means.

Mr. BLANTON. Let the House vote on it.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Oh, no; just a minute; we know something about procedure, too.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington will indicate the words he desires taken down. The Clerk will report the words.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON. I repeat, it is asinine to contend that anyone must tell the gentleman from Missouri what to do here or how to do it—it is asinine.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think there is anything in the language quoted to merit a point of order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, another point of order.

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to conclude the ruling.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. May I make another point of order?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will remain quiet until the Chair finishes the ruling.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. All right.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was about to say that the language referred to does not even refer to the gentleman from Washington. It is simply stated that it is asinine to undertake to tell the gentleman from Missouri or to instruct the gentleman from Missouri on the subject of parliamentary law. The Chair will now hear the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the point of order, I thought I was being complimented by being called an ass by the gentleman from Texas. Now that I am not complimented, I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas will proceed.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, whatever has been done by your committee, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], to stop communism in the Washington schools, and whatever little help I may render this committee from time to time, or any other committee, is done, in our opinion, for the good of the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, when we stopped communism from being taught in the Washington schools to the 92,000 school children—and we have stopped it; there is no question about that [applause]—we did it for their protection, and there is not going to be any subversive, insidious propaganda put out in our schools to sovietize the school children of the Nation's Capital. [Applause.] I wish my friends on the Republican side would talk to my good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] in

reference to what he knows about this situation. I wish my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle would talk to our colleagues the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JACOBSEN] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. JOHNSON], about all they know of the situation now confronting us with reference to the Washington schools. My colleagues will find that everything we have done has been done conscientiously, unafraid, and in the interest of the people whom we represent. We are not going to be deterred by any onslaught from Washington newspapers or anybody else in doing our duty.

Mr. Speaker, who is it that is taking the side of communism in Washington? I am not. It is not the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. It is not the members of our committee. Who is lending the Communists aid and encouragement? Who is encouraging them? I am not. It is not the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] or my committee. Why all of this sympathy for communism that we see almost daily appearing in Washington newspapers? You will find it all in the Daily Worker, the mouthpiece of Soviet Russia, being published in New York every week. You will find the ones who attack me being likewise applauded by the Daily Worker. It does not applaud me. I would consider it a reflection if the Daily Worker ever said anything nice about me. I would feel like I had been disgraced. I would feel there was something the matter with my patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, all this effort and stir is to try to get this anticommunism rider repealed. When an amendment to repeal that rider is brought in this House we will meet the sponsors in a parliamentary way. We will not meet them before the Cosmos Club or the clubs of Washington, but will meet them on the floor of the House, where legislation is passed in an orderly way. We will meet them on that proposition at any time.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Has the Daily Worker a press representative in the gallery of either the House or the Senate?

Mr. BLANTON. I hope not.

Mr. MAY. I do, too.

Mr. BLANTON. We see, however, some Daily Worker communistic sympathy floating around here. Mr. Speaker, there is heard on this floor once in a while some of the same arguments that you see in the Daily Worker against Congress and what Congress does for the protection of the people. Speaking about Washington people, did you know that our committee right now is working heart and soul, shoulder to shoulder, with the representatives of the Federated Clubs in Washington on this proposition? They are the ones with whom we are harmoniously working. There is no discord whatever. Once in a while you hear from one of the scores of associates here and there that there was a resolution passed about this or that matter, but with the authorized representatives of the Federated Clubs of Washington we are working in complete harmony and in perfect accord on this proposition to stop communism in the schools of Washington.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. In order that we may have some light as well as heat upon this subject, may I ask the gentleman whether it is teaching the facts concerning communism which is prohibited here in Washington or the advocacy of communism?

Mr. BLANTON. I will say it is ridiculous to charge that teachers could not tell the children that Russia is a subversive government which requires the people not to believe in God, not to believe in any form of religion—a government that does not believe in orderly constitutions, a government that believes and advocates the destruction of our Constitution and the overthrow by force and violence the Government of the United States. Any teacher may tell the children about those things right now and there is nothing to keep them from doing so; but they cannot teach or advocate communism in the sense of inculcating its principles, and they cannot

indoctrinate any of its principles. We have stopped all that. And, in my opinion, this Congress will never allow any "red" sympathizers to get it to repeal its action.

[Here the gavel fell.]

"LITTLE WATERS"—A BOOK REVIEW

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, conservation, at least in my opinion, is the most important subject before the American people, and two Government publications are of vast importance: One, the National Resources Board Report, dated 1934, which is a monumental piece of work, intelligently and attractively done; and the other, Little Waters—Their Use and Relations to the Land, which has just been published. Therefore, I am writing what amounts to a book review, hoping that people will take an interest in it, or, if they do not read the book, I have condensed some of the principal facts here.

The author is listed as H. S. Person, who, for some reason, calls himself a consulting economist, with the cooperation of E. Johnston Coil, who is only an economist, and Robert T. Beall, who is an associate economist. Outside of this display of titles, which means nothing to 120,000,000 Americans, they have done a good piece of work and deserve credit for it. The book has the backing of H. H. Bennett, Chief of Soil Conservation Service; Morris L. Cooke, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration; R. G. Tugwell, Administrator of the Resettlement Administration; and Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior.

The publication indicates a new high in Government publications from the viewpoint of form, clearness, attractiveness, and effectiveness. It is all wrapped up in pretty covers, picturing water running on the good earth—which is all right, as the cost is no more than for an ugly cover. More, it is written in plain English, almost good American. The last chapter of the book is poorly written and might just as well be omitted, for it is a lot of Pollyannic nonsense and has no part in the book. The book as a whole, however, is excellent.

IF THE LAND PERISH, HOW SHALL MAN SURVIVE?

This book was sent to Congress in a special message of the President, who realizes the necessity of conservation and who understands this subject as well as any man in America. The grave necessity of conservation is impressed; let us save our little waters, and, "if the land perish"—it proclaims dramatically in the foreword of Land and Man—"how shall man survive?"—and then it goes on to tell us how we can survive.

EROSION—DEVASTATION—BUT A CHANCE TO REHABILITATE

Drawings, the hydrologic cycle, simple, with enough color to be attractive, explain the function of water in the soil, the water table, and precipitation, infiltration, evaporation. Pictures show the murderous devastation of wind erosion—of "dead land"—destroyed by overcropping or overgrazing. Horrifying washaways, ghoul-like gullies; skeleton-like houses covered by earth piled up by the wind, surrounded by fallen trees and broken windmills; stunted corn, eroded cow paths—these and others pain the eye for looking. An old soldier sees in all this the devastation of modern war.

Then, not like a pacifist's sweet dream, we are shown in a practical way how to save our soil and lands, how to plow on contours, to terrace, to strip-crop, build check dams, and build back the country, start again infiltration, water table, plant life, fertility—how, in effect, to save and conserve the country in which we live.

It is a grand and glorious little book, and though it is not written with any flash, the drama of the subject holds you on. It will prove, I think, the prayer book of the conservationists, just as the report of the National Resources Board shall be their bible.

Speaking of outstanding social losses, they say:

With respect to conservation of water assets (we shall consider later conservation of soils) the outstanding losses are: First, a large proportion of the waters precipitated on the land surface find their way to the oceans without having rendered all their potential services to man; and, second, in their course they destroy property and frequently human lives.

The necessity of a larger supply of ground water, or "underground water store", for every purpose; and the necessity for conservation in relation to highways, industrial uses, and municipal life is demonstrated. Also the devastating effect of the washing away of fertile topsoils, which will take literally centuries to rehabilitate the injury that took no longer than a generation.

AMERICA NOT PERMANENT—IT CAN WASH AWAY LIKE SAHARA AND GOBI DESERTS

Then two challenging paragraphs:

The question whether the United States is a permanent country, first raised some 70 years ago, has been considered fantastic. Recent measurements indicate that it is far from fantastic—is very real and practical—and that one can rationally assert that in another century this great American granary may have become inadequate to support our population if erosion is permitted to continue at the present rate of increase. Already in some sections of the country once cultivated lands have been reduced to sterility.

A deep-rooted but utterly fallacious American tradition is that agriculture is inherently a permanent industry. As waters are lost, the soil may be lost. "When the soil is gone, men must go; and the process does not take long," said Theodore Roosevelt. Recent studies indicate that the Sahara and Gobi Deserts were once occupied by prosperous peoples.

And soil losses through cultivation is graphically shown in black-and-white chart pictures, as well as wastage of basic soils and vegetative cover, leading the Nation as a whole into tragic social and economic consequences. Worse, erosion is greatly accelerating and causing loss to billions of dollars of permanent investments in navigation, water-power sites, municipal utilities, irrigation districts, and the general life and economy of people living everywhere.

Then it says:

No nation, however vigorous it may otherwise appear to be, can survive a progressively declining agriculture. The sustenance it draws from the soil determines its powers of resistance. In a final analysis, the food, clothing, and shelter of merchant, manufacturer, and banker come from the land. Their prosperity rests definitely on the prosperity of agriculture.

Engineers are quite properly berated for giving so little attention to watershed problems in their hurry to engineer on great rivers. Our forefathers quite innocently destroyed forests, causing waste and destruction leading to our condition.

At page 41—exactly half through the book—when we are about to feel the battle of our national existence is lost, we are given a chance to turn over a new national leaf, repair the injury, and save for the future. Leopold, distinguished scientist, they quote, "our dominion once gained" must "be self-perpetuating rather than self-destructive"; and for this last half of the book, ways and means are told to reestablish the true order of the land.

We are told:

The governing objective in regulation and control should be for general rehabilitation of rural culture, all practicable conservation and profitable use of waters and soils, and revision where necessary to the end of land occupation and use. Involved in this would be component objectives—relinquishment of submarginal and marginal cropped lands to vegetative cover and to ponds, reservoirs, and marshes; more intensive occupancy and cropping of superior lands; adoption of revised agricultural practices to eliminate erosion and promote infiltration.

WATER HAS NO RESPECT TO STATE BOUNDARIES—NOT EVEN FARM FENCES

And again:

One of the basic conditions of action is that physical factors have no regard for line fences between farms or for political boundaries. The rain that falls on one farm may flow onto and erode a neighboring farm; even small streams usually traverse several townships or counties; an underground reservoir may underlie a very large area.

And in relation to drainage problems it says:

The area of the problem of regulation and use of little waters is coextensive with the area of the United States, but any national program must consist of coordinated programs for specific small drainage areas.

Pertaining to erosion control we read:

The physical factors are such that theoretically the beginning of water and soil regulation and control should be at the raindrop and rill stage rather than on larger bodies of water downstream. Practically it should be done at least simultaneously. For where there is a series of dependent influences, regulation should begin with the first of the series. Given erosion control of individual farms, conditions are set for the establishment of ponds and reser-

voirs on the farms; given erosion control and ponds and reservoirs on individual farms, regulation of creeks and other headwater streams by communities is more feasible; given such regulation on an entire headwater area, regulation and control of big waters below are more effective and economical.

BUSINESS CANNOT EXIST WITHOUT PRODUCTIVITY OF SOIL

Mr. American, this country must be preserved by systematic, intelligent planning, whether the word "planning" is pleasant to some people or not. When I hear people denouncing planning I wonder if they know what they mean. We are told this is socialism, this being a vague accusation that planning is wicked. Is it sensible to let this country wash away? We know it is not. We know, moreover, that business cannot exist on any scale understood by Americans, if the productivity of the soil is destroyed and erosion goes unchecked and floods left uncontrolled. In this Little Waters we are given constructive, intelligent information. They quote George W. Field, who said:

Dirt farming must now be coordinated with water farming to provide a balanced food ration for a well-balanced nation.

I think it plain that planning and saving our lands is the opposite of being wicked or sinister, and that democratic government will cease to exist unless we save the soil.

The book continues to give methods of saving soil, as practiced by individuals on farms and small areas of lands. These methods are enumerated:

First. Selective use of land.

Second. Rotation of crops, wherein it is said "uninterrupted cultivation promotes erosion, and loss of the topsoil is a drain on the farmer's capital assets"; and also "forces generated by the World War appear to have so changed economic conditions that a new agricultural economy must be developed in the United States. In that connection there will be required wise judgment and skillful management of agricultural factors—conservation as well as exploitation, conservation of water assets as well as soil assets"; and that the time of the slipshod farmer without training, judgment, or skill is over, and such farming cannot be personally successful or publicly tolerated. I believe the latter—that a farm dangerous to other farms because of erosion is as dangerous as one house is dangerous to other houses in cities because of fire hazards or lack of sanitation.

Third. Cultivation of tilled lands, where methods are discussed with, first, cultivation itself, moisture, weed and vegetative covering control; second, contour plowing; third, terracing; fourth, stub planting or strip cropping, and then it says:

The reader may be inclined to think that this is too expensive a form of agriculture. From the point of view of an era when there was plenty of free or moderately priced fertile land, when an owner could exploit one particular farm and then move to new and fertile land previously untouched—what the Europeans long ago named "robber agriculture"—from that point of view it may usually be a more expensive form of agriculture to the individual, although not to society. However, that era of exploitation is passed. Today the landowner who desires to leave to his children a farm that is more productive—worth more, instead of much less—or a nation that desires to maintain self-sufficiency in feeding, clothing, and housing itself must observe those agricultural practices which will conserve the waters and the soils. It is no longer possible to abandon robbed land and turn to new, rich lands to be had at the cost of a trek in a covered wagon. As a matter of fact, numerous farms can be operated much more profitably on a basis of correct land use, such as that called for under the system of soil and water conservation outlined above, than where all the land is farmed without regard to principles of soil adaptability and soil conservation.

Fourth. Check dams in gullies, where methods to reduce velocity of waters and build up soils by low-cost gully control with logs, brush, and straw and the planting of shrubs is explained.

Fifth. Check dams on streams.

Sixth. Ponds and reservoirs.

Seventh. Swamps, marshes, and wet lands.

CONCLUSION; WASTE AS DETRIMENTAL TO CITY AS FARM LIFE; WE MUST PRESERVE RESOURCES

Concluding, I recommend this book to the thoughtful consideration of every American. We have been talking about agriculture from a viewpoint of price control and so-called benefits to each American farmer. It seems to me that we

must now give serious and close attention to conservation of the soil, and not by any means for the sole benefit of the individual farmer but for the preservation of the Nation. If individual farms suffer from erosion, they are worthless to the owners and worthless to posterity. Likewise, erosion on one farm causes erosion on another, and the wastage of such waters in some cases causes floods for miles away, and sometimes causes the beginning of deserts and wasteland. Such practices therefore destroy cities. An industrial worker living on the twelfth floor of a tenement or an apartment house in New York City or Philadelphia has as much interest in soil conservation as a farmer at the source of the Mississippi in the State of North Dakota or Minnesota, or a farmer anywhere in the whole United States of America. Any study of civilization shows that when the soil is destroyed the people are destroyed, and the situation of the soil of America is a desperate one. To go into the enumeration of more facts may prove tiresome, but this book, *Little Waters*, effectively shows the wastage of our lands, water, and other natural resources.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—
INTERNATIONAL MANUFACTURERS' SALES CO. OF AMERICA, INC.,
A. S. POSTNIKOFF, TRUSTEE (H. DOC. NO. 405)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 4178, an act for the relief of the International Manufacturers' Sales Co. of America, Inc., A. S. Postnikoff, trustee.

This bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the International Manufacturers' Sales Co. of America, Inc., A. S. Postnikoff, trustee, the sum of \$900,000 in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for losses sustained by the claimant company during the years 1918 and 1919 while engaged in furnishing articles of necessity to the Siberian population of Russia under and in pursuance to the plans formulated by the War Trade Board in the fall of the year 1918 for extending economic aid to the Siberian population of Russia. The bill also states that said losses were incurred through the inability of the claimant company to exchange the Russian rubles received from the sales of said articles into American dollars because of the regulation issued by the Federal Reserve Board under date of February 14, 1919, under authority of the Executive order of January 26, 1918, prohibiting the exportation or importation of Russian rubles or the transfer of funds for their purchase by persons or dealers in the United States.

It is not asserted, nor is it a fact, that the claim in question rests upon any legal basis whatsoever. The claimant company was engaged in business in Siberia, and had, by its own voluntary act, shipped a large stock of shoes from the United States to Vladivostok, where it was held in storage pending sale. The representatives of the War Trade Board, pursuant to a national policy, lent its assistance in the sale of the goods in question, chiefly in facilitating transportation and delivery. The funds received by the claimant company for these sales were not, at any time, handled by or in the possession of the representatives of the Government, but, on the contrary, were deposited in Siberian banks to the credit of the claimant company.

The action of the Federal Reserve Board in adopting regulations concerning the exportation and importation of Russian rubles, which, it is asserted, made it impossible for the claimant company to convert its funds into currency of the United States, was manifestly an exercise of sovereign power which does not contemplate compensation for incidental damages even if it could be shown that such damages had occurred. In the present case, however, the direct cause of the loss appears to be the action of the Soviet Government in taking over the assets of the banks in which the claimant company had deposited its funds and in canceling outstanding currency. To recompense the claimant company for the loss thus sustained, out of funds in the Treasury, would extend the rule followed in the matter of claims alleged to be based upon moral considerations to

classes of cases not hitherto considered sufficiently meritorious to warrant special treatment and would open the door to a multitude of cases fully as well founded.

The Secretary of the Treasury, the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Comptroller General, and the Attorney General unite in recommending that the bill be vetoed.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 11, 1936.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large on the Journal and ordered printed as a document.

Without objection, the bill and the message will be referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to say that we who opposed this vicious piece of legislation should like to see it disposed of for all time. I can see no reason for its going to a committee, and I am going to object to its going to a committee and move the previous question on the President's veto. I want to vote to sustain the veto. The President has rendered a great service in vetoing this measure, and I want him and the country to know that we are with him on it.

The SPEAKER. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that his motion will require a roll call and take up that much more time.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, Mr. Speaker, but it is important enough to have a roll call. We must stop this kind of legislation.

The SPEAKER. I think it is stopped.

Mr. RANKIN. But I want to be dead sure of it, and this is the only way those of us who oppose this legislation and agree with the President can get on record as opposing this legislative outrage. I ask for a roll call on the President's veto and on that I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House on reconsideration agree to pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Those voting to sustain the veto will vote "no"?

The SPEAKER. Those who wish to vote to pass the bill will vote "aye" and those who wish to vote against its passage will vote "no."

Mr. RANKIN. Then our vote is "no."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 4, nays 333, answered "present" 1, not voting 92, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—4

Cavicchia	Clark, N. C.	Kvale	Pittenger
-----------	--------------	-------	-----------

NAYS—333

Adair	Burdick	Cullen	Ekwall
Allen	Caldwell	Cummings	Ellenbogen
Andresen	Cannon, Mo.	Curley	Engel
Andrews, N. Y.	Carlson	Daly	Englebright
Ashbrook	Carmichael	Darden	Evans
Ayers	Carpenter	Darrow	Faddis
Bacharach	Carter	Deen	Ferguson
Bacon	Cartwright	Delaney	Fernandez
Bankhead	Cary	DeRouen	Fish
Barden	Castellow	Dickstein	Fitzpatrick
Barry	Chapman	Dies	Flannagan
Beiter	Christianson	Dingell	Fletcher
Bell	Church	Dirksen	Focht
Berlin	Clalborne	Ditter	Ford, Calif.
Biermann	Cochran	Dobbins	Ford, Miss.
Blackney	Coffee	Dockweiler	Frey
Blanton	Colden	Dondero	Fuller
Bloom	Cole, Md.	Dorsey	Fulmer
Boehne	Cole, N. Y.	Doughton	Gambrill
Boileau	Collins	Doxey	Gasque
Boland	Colmer	Drewry	Gavagan
Bolton	Cooley	Driscoll	Gearhart
Boykin	Cooper, Tenn.	Driver	Gehrman
Boylan	Costello	Duffey, Ohio	Gifford
Brewster	Cox	Duffy, N. Y.	Gilchrist
Brooks	Cravens	Duncan	Gildea
Brown, Ga.	Crawford	Dunn, Miss.	Gillette
Brown, Mich.	Creal	Dunn, Pa.	Gingery
Buck	Crosby	Eagle	Goldsborough
Buckbee	Cross, Tex.	Eckert	Granfield
Buckler, Minn.	Crowe	Edmiston	Gray, Pa.
Burch	Culkin	Elcher	Green

Greenway	Ludlow	Patton	Spence
Greenwood	Lundeen	Pearson	Starnes
Greever	McAndrews	Perkins	Stefan
Guyer	McClellan	Peterson, Fla.	Stewart
Gwynne	McCormack	Peterson, Ga.	Stubbs
Haines	McFarlane	Pettengill	Sullivan
Halleck	McGehee	Peyser	Sumners, Tex.
Hamlin	McGrath	Pfeifer	Sutphin
Hancock, N. Y.	McKeough	Pierce	Sweeney
Harlan	McLaughlin	Plumley	Taber
Hart	McLean	Polk	Tarver
Harter	McMillan	Powers	Taylor, Colo.
Hess	McReynolds	Quinn	Taylor, S. C.
Higgins, Conn.	McSwain	Ramsay	Terry
Higgins, Mass.	Maas	Randolph	Thom
Hildebrandt	Mahon	Rankin	Thomason
Hill, Knute	Main	Ransley	Thompson
Hobbs	Mansfield	Reed, Ill.	Thurston
Hollister	Mapes	Reed, N. Y.	Tinkham
Hook	Marcanonio	Reilly	Tolan
Hope	Marshall	Rich	Tonry
Houston	Martin, Colo.	Richards	Turner
Huddleston	Martin, Mass.	Richardson	Turpin
Hull	Massingale	Risk	Umstead
Imhoff	Maverick	Robertson	Underwood
Jacobsen	May	Robinson, Utah	Utterbach
Jenkins, Ohio	Mead	Robson, Ky.	Vinson, Ga.
Johnson, Tex.	Merritt, Conn.	Rogers, Mass.	Vinson, Ky.
Johnson, W. Va.	Merritt, N. Y.	Rogers, N. H.	Wadsworth
Jones	Michener	Rudd	Wallgren
Kahn	Millard	Russell	Walter
Kelly	Miller	Sadowski	Warren
Kennedy, N. Y.	Mitchell, Ill.	Sanders, Tex.	Wearin
Kenney	Mitchell, Tenn.	Sandlin	Welch
Kerr	Monaghan	Sauthoff	Werner
Kinzer	Moran	Schneider, Wis.	West
Kloeb	Moritz	Schuetz	Whelchel
Knutson	Mott	Schulte	Whittington
Kocialkowski	Murdock	Scott	Wilcox
Kopplemann	Nelson	Sears	Williams
Kramer	Nichols	Seger	Wilson, Pa.
Lambertson	Norton	Shanley	Withrow
Lambeth	O'Brien	Shannon	Wolfenden
Lanham	O'Connell	Sisson	Wolverton
Lea, Calif.	O'Day	Smith, Conn.	Wood
Lehibach	O'Leary	Smith, Va.	Woodruff
Lemke	Oliver	Smith, Wash.	Woodrum
Lesinski	Owen	Smith, W. Va.	Young
Lewis, Colo.	Palmisano	Snell	Zioncheck
Lewis, Md.	Parks	Snyder, Pa.	
Lucas	Parsons	Somers, N. Y.	
Luckey	Patterson	South	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Ryan

NOT VOTING—92

Amle	Dempsey	Johnson, Okla.	Rayburn
Andrew, Mass.	Dietrich	Kee	Reece
Arends	Disney	Keller	Rogers, Okla.
Beam	Doutrich	Kennedy, Md.	Romjue
Binderup	Eaton	Kleberg	Sabath
Bland	Farley	Kniffin	Sanders, La.
Brennan	Fenerty	Lamneck	Schaefer
Buchanan	Fiesinger	Larrabee	Scrugham
Buckley, N. Y.	Gassaway	Lee, Okla.	Secrest
Bulwinkle	Goodwin	Lord	Short
Burnham	Gray, Ind.	McGroarty	Sirovich
Cannon, Wis.	Gregory	McLeod	Stack
Casey	Griswold	Maloney	Steagall
Celler	Hancock, N. C.	Mason	Taylor, Tenn.
Chandler	Hartley	Meeks	Thomas
Citron	Healey	Montague	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	Hennings	Montet	Treadway
Connery	Hill, Ala.	O'Connor	Weaver
Cooper, Ohio	Hill, Samuel B.	O'Malley	White
Corning	Hoeppel	O'Neal	Wigglesworth
Crosser, Ohio	Hoffman	Patman	Wilson, La.
Crowther	Holmes	Rabaut	Wolcott
Dear	Jenckes, Ind.	Ramspeck	Zimmerman

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the veto was sustained.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Treadway.
 Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
 Mr. Bland with Mr. Goodwin.
 Mr. Griswold with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Hoffman.
 Mr. Gray of Indiana with Mr. Lord.
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Thomas.
 Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Wolcott.
 Mr. Weaver with Mr. Short.
 Mr. Steagall with Mr. McLeod.
 Mr. Montague with Mr. Hartley.
 Mr. Samuel B. Hill with Mr. Crowther.
 Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Eaton.
 Mr. Connery with Mr. Arends.
 Mr. Crosser of Ohio with Mr. Burnham.
 Mr. Beam with Mr. Holmes.
 Mr. Corning with Mr. Reece.
 Mr. Disney with Mr. Taylor of Tennessee.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Fenerty.

Mr. Farley with Mr. Wigglesworth.
 Mr. Fiesinger with Mr. Doutrich.
 Mr. Lamneck with Mr. Tobey.
 Mr. Maloney with Mr. Amle.
 Mr. Kniffin with Mr. Schaefer.
 Mr. Hennings with Mr. Dear.
 Mr. Wilson of Louisiana with Mr. O'Malley.
 Mr. Gregory with Mr. Buckley.
 Mr. Brennan with Mr. Romjue.
 Mr. Keller with Mr. O'Neal.
 Mr. Sabath with Mr. Zimmerman.
 Mr. Meeks with Mr. Mason.
 Mr. Montet with Mr. Dempsey.
 Mr. White with Mr. Sirovich.
 Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Dietrich.
 Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Healey.
 Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Clark of Idaho.
 Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Binderup.
 Mrs. Jenckes of Indiana with Mr. Gassaway.
 Mr. Hill of Alabama with Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Kee with Mr. Chandler.
 Mr. Sanders of Louisiana with Mr. Citron.
 Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Kennedy of Maryland.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that the following Members of the House are temporarily absent from the Capitol on official business; and if they were present, they would each vote "no" upon the vote just had: MESSRS. SABATH, HILL of Alabama, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, SCRUGHAM, TAYLOR of Colorado, GREGORY, and CANNON of Missouri.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded, and the message and bill referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed, and the Clerk directed to notify the Senate of the action of the House.

ELLENBOGEN BILL, H. R. 9072

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made by me on January 29, 1936, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor, of which the Honorable Mr. KELLER, of Illinois, is chairman, during hearings on the Ellenbogen bill H. R. 9072, as follows:

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am delighted to have this opportunity of coming before your committee.

I want to say in behalf of the wage earners of the country that they are fortunate, indeed, to have the members who compose this committee which is now holding hearings on this bill because of their interest in the wage earners of the country and their deep desire to be helpful to them.

I agree with the statement made by the chairman some days ago that if this is not the proper bill to take care of that great class of people who need the assistance of the Federal Government today, you and your committee will work out something to take care of the situation.

I find that a great many of the people who oppose any legislation proposed by the Congress in the interest of unorganized classes have no objection to these unorganized groups doing the same thing intended under these bills. And, in that agriculture and labor are unorganized, they have not been able to compete with well-organized industry to the extent of getting a square deal. It is my belief that the Congress of the United States should pass legislation to enable that great class of people to do for themselves that which they are unable to do now, in that they are not organized and never will be thoroughly organized.

In other words, it is an easy matter for industrial groups to organize, monopolize, fix prices and wages, in that they are composed of a small group of people, in a great many instances, who are well educated and well financed. On the other hand, agriculture and wage earners, being composed of millions of individuals, in many instances uneducated—through no fault of their own but because of their financial condition—are absolutely helpless in trying to organize so as to bring about bargaining power in selling farm products and demanding fair wages.

I have not had an opportunity to study the Ellenbogen bill, and naturally would not be able to speak on its real merits. But I wanted to appear before your committee and tell you that I am very much concerned about and in sympathy with that class of people who, as I said a few minutes ago, need the protection of the Government in the passage of legislation that will enable them to take care of their interests, especially when they have to go up against these well-organized and well-financed groups.

In my State we have a number of textile mills, and in my district there are quite a number of them. I believe that the operators of the mills in South Carolina are trying to be just as fair as they can possibly be to the employees; but without some national legislation so that we can make the fellow who is not willing to cooperate or who is not willing to be fair with his employees, naturally the people in my State, perhaps, would not

be able to do that which they would like to do or that which they should do.

Something has been said about the problem of passing legislation coming within the Constitution of the United States, especially after the decision of the Supreme Court some days ago on the A. A. A. It is my belief that the Constitution is elastic enough to pass legislation to take care of the interests of the great masses of the people who, as I said a little while ago, are unorganized and apparently helpless at this time. It is my contention that the Constitution of the United States was so written that we can legislate today to take care of the masses of the people and still remain within the Constitution. I would not like to think that in this day and generation the Congress would not be able to pass legislation to take care of the unorganized who have to go up against the rules and regulations of these well-organized groups. However, I can easily understand that, perhaps, although the men who wrote the Constitution of the United States were capable, outstanding, patriotic citizens at the time of the writing of this great document, they could not visualize the tremendous increase in population, communication, and other developments that we have at this time so as to be able to write a constitution 150 years ago which would take care of every situation that might arise at the present time. And if the present Constitution is not elastic enough to take care of these problems, although I believe it is, there is only one thing to be done—that is, let the people decide whether or not they want to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to take care of this situation.

I want to say to you that I am deeply interested in any type of legislation that will look to the welfare and protection of the great masses of the people who really need to be placed on an equal basis with these well-organized groups. I have this feeling largely because of the understanding I have for suffering humanity. I have had to go up against a great many of the problems which are now confronting the agricultural interests and the wage earners of this country. I was born and reared on a farm. I had to walk 4 miles to secure a high-school education. I started life's work as a young man behind a grocery counter at \$10 per month and board. During all of these years I worked, as stated, first, as a wage earner, then engaged in the mercantile business, country banking, and farming. And during all of this time I had to go up against well-organized and well-financed groups. I am in a position to understand and sympathize with the people for whom I am speaking here today. I have had a long and stumpy road to travel because of not being able as an individual to cope with these well-organized and well-financed groups I am talking to you about. Therefore, as previously stated, I am deeply interested in seeing to it that this great group of innocent toilers of the soil and wage earners of the country get a square deal to the extent that they are placed on an equal basis with these well-organized and well-protected groups.

We have heard much about the policy of some people in regard to "sharing the wealth of the country." The policy I am interested in is to protect the people we have been talking about to the extent that they may be able to make for themselves a name and a reasonable livelihood to which they are clearly entitled. It is unthinkable to me, knowing as I do the conditions under which the farmers of this country have been operating as well as the conditions under which the wage earners of the country have been operating, knowing that they are not able out of their experience to demand for themselves a square deal; that the Congress of the United States, under the welfare clause of the Constitution of the United States, is not able to pass legislation to do that which these people should do for themselves but which they are unable to do because of not being able to organize. My father and his father and generations of the past have submitted to this unfair procedure. Many of them lived in poverty, were unable to secure for themselves a home, education, and many of the good things in life that other people were receiving and to which they were clearly entitled. But it is my belief and contention that the generation of today and unborn generations will not submit to this unfair and uneconomic treatment at the hands of these organized groups, the Congress, and the decisions of the Supreme Court.

It is my belief that some of the highest type citizens and some of the best brains to be found in the country can be found in the rural sections and the industrial centers. But, because of the handicap brought about under the present situation we have been talking about, these people are not permitted to exert and develop themselves to that extent to which they are entitled and which would enable them to become a real asset to their community, State, and Nation.

I realize that there are a great many people on the farm, in the factory village, as well as many who reside in the great cities of the country that, if today the wealth of the country were divided and turned over to them, the days would not be many before it would go back to those who control the finances of the country at this time. But I do contend that there are millions of citizens who today are unable, as stated, to own their own homes, educate their children, and take their places in this great Republic to which they are entitled and which position they would possess if they had a fair, square deal that I am interested in having the Congress of the United States provide or give to them.

I thank you.

Mr. KELLER. I thank you, Congressman FULMER.

Mr. WOOD. I appreciate the statement made by our colleague, Mr. Chairman. It was a very valuable addition that he has made to the testimony already given.

Mr. KELLER. I am very glad you expressed that compliment. It is my own sentiment.

Mr. WOOD. I think it expresses the view of every member of the committee.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11035) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, I may say that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOLTON] and I had expected to finish general debate on this bill today and begin reading it for amendment the first thing in the morning. However, these delays have caused us to change our plans, and, with the approval of the gentleman from Ohio, I now ask unanimous consent that we may run on with general debate this afternoon, with the hope that there will be very little general debate in the morning, if any at all; the time, of course, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11035, the War Department appropriation bill, with Mr. PARSONS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOCKWEILER].

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair advise us how the time now stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas has occupied 1 hour and 37 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio 1 hour and 26 minutes.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, as a member of the subcommittee on the Army appropriation bill I wish to make this statement: The seven members of that committee, including myself, have not considered this appropriation bill haphazardly or neglectfully, but we have given it our most serious attention.

I think you will agree with me that in times like these—as Shakespeare would say, "When times are out of joint"—your committee, more than ever before, has been more careful in the appropriation of money for national security. We sat in committee several weeks before this Congress went into session. We came to Washington and met on December 15 last. We have been virtually in session ever since that time.

I mention this fact, not to bring out the idea that your committee is more devoted to its duties than other committees, but I feel that there is in this country today an attitude of disparagement toward expenditures for national defense; and so, my friends, my theme is national defense.

Someone said yesterday during the course of the debate, "Who is it that determines the measure or the standard of the necessities for national defense?"

Why, my friends, it is not our Committee on Appropriations for the Army, it is not the Military Affairs Committee who determines what is necessary for national defense of this Nation, but it is the accumulation of evidence through the years that has predicated this result.

During the World War and before our participation in it, in 1916, we recast or re-formed the national defense for the security needs of this Nation. As a result, the National Defense Act was passed and we went in and conducted our part of the World War under the terms of that National Defense Act of 1916.

However, my friends, we had some experiences during that war, and after the accumulation of those experiences it was determined to recast the National Defense Act of 1916.

So in 1920 the Military Affairs Committee, after many months of study, hearings, and considerations of every possible angle, brought out upon the floor of this House the National Defense Act of 1920. That is today the law that governs the personnel, and I might say the structure of our national defense of this Nation.

Since then there have been two important boards that have considered whether there should be any further revision of our National Defense Act and the things that should be done

to secure this great Nation of ours. Consequently you have the report of the Drum Board and also you have the report of the Baker Board, and all these boards that have studied the subject and made determinations for the Nation are not necessarily militaristic boards. They have not always had the military viewpoint. They have been civilian in character, and I refer to the Baker Board that gives us our standard or norm to follow, particularly in matters of aviation, and the general headquarters that has had to do with all matters of aviation. That board was entirely a civilian board, and when it speaks I think the Members of Congress, particularly the committees of Congress in charge of these duties of national defense, should listen to such boards, and take heed of their recommendations.

There has been considerable published on the subject of national defense, particularly charging this Nation and the Congress with militarizing the country. I hold in my hand a very recent article published in the Atlantic Monthly of February, which in a more or less oblique manner criticizes the Congress for its activities in the last 3 years in rehabilitating the national defense of this Nation. Let us review the picture for a moment. Three years ago we had an army of enlisted men of 118,000. Last year this Congress provided for an army of 165,000 enlisted men. However, the President saw fit to enlist only one hundred and forty-seven thousand-and-odd men. This year this present bill provides for an army of enlisted men of not less than 150,000. We have a Nation of 127,000,000, with \$400,000,000,000 of value to it, with 3,000,000 square miles of territory in continental United States, and does anyone think a little police force in the way of an international army, so to speak, of 150,000 enlisted men, is too much for this great Nation?

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I do not wish to be interrupted now. Let me call attention to the fact that out of 147,000 enlisted men we have today there are but 120,581 that are in the combat or fighting arm of the Army. We all must recognize that the Army has various components, and there are components in the Army that do not bear arms, but, of course, they are as necessary in the make-up of the Army as the Infantry or the Cavalry. In the Army today with 147,000 men we have 51,467 in the Infantry, 9,619 in the Cavalry, in the Field Artillery 19,833, in the Coast Artillery 15,492, in the Air Corps 15,424, in the Engineer Corps 5,046, in the Signal Corps 3,105, and in the Chemical Warfare Service 595, making a grand total of 120,581. I have given you every branch of the Army that is considered a combat arm. Forty thousand of these men are in our possessions and 20,000 are policing the border along the Mexican-United States line. What result do we get? I say to those who prate about militarizing the United States that the high command in Washington could not within a week's time gather together in continental United States more than 35,000 fighting troops to protect us against any sort of emergency. It is true that our Army is not all regular troops. We have the National Guard, so to speak, 48 little armies, and that National Guard has 195,000 troops in it, both officers and men. Under the terms of this bill we are giving it an additional 5,000 men, making a total of 200,000 men in all of the 48 little armies known as the National Guard.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I cannot yield because I have such little time. We are not yet doing what the Baker Board has asked us to do, and what the Drum Board has suggested that we ought to do for national defense. We are not today within 48 percent of the National Defense Act of 1920, and yet people prate about the fact that the United States is going militaristic. I am far from militaristic myself. My attitude of mind is in the opposite direction, and if I thought the United States was getting into such a rut, I would be the first to stand before you and decry against it. All we ask is national security. Mr. Ford has more men in his factory at the River Rouge than the whole standing army of the United States.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Some people say that we have built up something huge, some Frankenstein that will destroy

America. The combined police forces of Philadelphia and Chicago and New York have more men in them than the standing Army of the United States, and still we talk about militarizing the United States!

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. For a brief question.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Would the gentleman advise then that we should double the appropriations to more than \$2,000,000,000?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. No. The United States cannot at this juncture afford to spend any more than we are spending.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. I am very much interested in the gentleman's speech. I am much interested in the fact that he brought out that there are more men in the combined police forces of New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia than in our standing Army today. I would also like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there are more employees in the Department of Agriculture today than we have in our standing Army.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mrs. O'DAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I yield.

Mrs. O'DAY. In spite of all this deficiency in our Army, is it true that out of every dollar that comes into the Treasury, 60 cents goes for wars, past and future, and the other 40 cents goes for all other expenses of Government?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I think the lady from New York might be quite right. At this juncture I am going to interrupt what I was going to say, and call attention to the fact that we have existed for 159 years as a Nation, and our batting average for wars has been one in every 29 years. I do not think there is a Member in this House who will contend that at the entrance of any one of those wars we have ever been prepared. It is my position that if at any time in the juncture of our national history we would have had adequate preparedness and security, we would not have been in any one of those wars. [Applause.]

Mrs. O'DAY. Why is it, after spending all of that money, we are so far behind in our national defense?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. We are spending more money now than we have spent in the years past, but we are trying to keep in peace, so far as the family of nations is concerned. I think that national security secures us in peace. That is my point of view. Other Members may disagree with me.

Mrs. O'DAY. Is it not true that 60 cents out of every dollar is spent on wars, past and future?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I think it might be true that 60 cents out of every dollar goes for past, present, and future wars. I am not going to deny that fact; but it adds to my argument and it strengthens my point of view. My argument is that while we are spending a billion dollars a year for pensions on account of past wars, and the Lord only knows how many more billions we will spend before the last veteran of the last war is gone, it would have been cheap economy for us, in 1914, when the record shows we only appropriated a little more than \$100,000,000 for the Army and national defense, to have spent a few hundred million more at that time, and we would not have been held up to the world in the despicable, indefensible manner as we were. I call attention to this fact, that when the world was at war and we were only spending \$100,000,000 a year for an Army, we had Pancho Villa on our hands along our southern border. He made a raid at Douglas, Ariz., and finally when he made many of those raids we determined we should do something about it. We determined we should chastise Pancho Villa. So we sent our great general, General Pershing, whom we all considered to be one of our most able generals, down there on an expedition. We raised an Army of fighting men to penetrate into Mexico to find Pancho Villa, and we came back with empty hands. We could not get Pancho Villa. The world saw this debacle, and then it was the world made up its mind. The Central Powers said, "Why, we can do what we want with America, because it cannot fight. If

they have men that can fight, they are not prepared to fight." So from that time on we were insulted. We were driven into the World War. We would have saved ourselves these multitudes of millions if we had been prepared. I repeat an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. If we are prepared, you will not see us getting into that conflict in Ethiopia or anywhere else. We cannot pass a neutrality law, the kind we might desire, to day, because we do not have sufficient preparedness. We cannot tell the world that we will not sell, because we have the richest nation in the world and we have the greatest resources. No nation today can conduct a war without our help. We have 40 percent of its gold. We have all the great natural resources for the purpose of conducting war. We can pass a neutrality bill when we have national security; when we can say, "You fellows can not do it." Then we will pass a neutrality law that will change the course of international law. But we can not do it today with our unprotected conditions.

Mrs. O'DAY. I think we can, perhaps.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. I am interested in the gentleman's statement that we cannot pass a neutrality law. What does the gentleman say is the reason?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Because we are not prepared to defend that neutrality.

Mr. McFARLANE. If we are not in a position to assert that neutrality now, what makes the gentleman believe we will ever be able to do it?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I think we are getting to the point now where we are securing ample national defense. We will have it in a few more years if we are let alone. I am not asking for everything that the National Defense Act asks for. I am just asking for half of it. I think we will have ample national defense.

Mr. McFARLANE. Then, would the gentleman say that the neutrality resolution which was passed last session, weak as it was, was a mistake and should not have been passed?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. No. That Neutrality Act was all right. I would vote for it again.

Mr. McFARLANE. Why should that not be continued with real teeth in it?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. The only kind of neutrality act that we have a right to pass, aside from the one that was passed, is one that is absolute; that gives no authority to any President, be he the President of my party or the President of anybody else's party, to say, "We will not sell something to you or we will sell something to you."

Mr. McFARLANE. Why should we not pass that kind of a law?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. International relations and the world's condition are such that we are not prepared to adopt such a law.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAY. For the 5 years I have been a member of the House Military Affairs Committee, the evidence from all the authorities of the Army is to the effect that we are wholly unprepared, so far as the air force is concerned. Now, with the Atlantic seaboard and with the Pacific coast and the Panama Canal, is there anything more important at this time than to prepare the Air Corps for national defense?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. If the gentleman will just stop there and let me answer this question. I do not believe the Air Corps is the be-all and the end-all of national defense. I am very gratified, however, to be able to say that there is now under construction and to be delivered because of past appropriations, 752 airplanes. This bill provides for 515 airplanes of various categories. If next year's Congress provides for 575 airplanes, we will have 1,782 airplanes which will be anywhere from a day to 2 years old, and our air

force will be in pretty good condition, considering the present state of the law.

Mr. MAY. I do not know just what is being done, but it seems that as fast as we accumulate planes of new construction others become obsolete, so that in reality we are making no actual progress in the number of planes in the force.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I do not know about that; but I just stated that there is in process of building and delivery now 752 planes for the Army. Five hundred and fifteen will be manufactured under the terms of this bill. My information is as of February 4, a few days ago, and it comes from the War Department.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I yield.

Mr. McSWAIN. According to the figures the gentleman has, by 1938, assuming that the Congress 1 year from now will be as generous as the gentleman's committee now proposes to be, there will still be something short of 1,800 effective serviceable combat planes.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. Does the gentleman remember that in 1926, 10 years ago, the House, as the world then stood and as the development of air power then stood, directed that the program of expansion of air power should in 5 years from 1926 accomplish a realization of 1,800 combat planes? So that even though in 1938 we should have reached the status indicated by the gentleman in his statement, we would still be short of the number we should have had 5 years ago, according to the program of 1926, and we will then be 8 years behind the program we contemplated in 1926, notwithstanding air power has greatly increased and the relative importance of the air force in warfare has tremendously increased since 1926. I am sorry to have made my question so long.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. The gentleman's question is quite lengthy, but I tried to follow it. Assuming that next year Congress is as generous to the Aviation Corps as we are this year, I figure there should be 1,782 planes, new planes, from 1 day old to 2 years old delivered to the Army by the close of 1938. In addition to that we will have whatever obsolete or other planes may be in existence. The gentleman from South Carolina is chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. So far as I know the only authorization now on the books provides for 1,800 planes for the Army.

Mr. McSWAIN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. One hundred and fifty-two of these planes must be assigned to the National Guard. So the Army would have only 1,748 active planes in its air force unless the Committee on Military Affairs reports out a bill in conformity with the recommendations of the Baker Board, which calls for 2,320 planes.

Mr. McSWAIN. The gentleman realizes the present authorization for additional planes continues to 1938. Before that time I hope we shall have authorization not only for what the Baker Board recommended but for what in my humble judgment we ought to have, to wit, 4,000 planes.

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one brief question?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Yes; for a brief question only.

Mr. LUCKEY. We hear it said repeatedly on the floor that our Army is unprepared. Can the gentleman tell me how our Army stands compared with the armies of the other nations of the world?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. We are eighteenth on the list.

Mr. LUCKEY. We are eighteenth on the list, but how does our appropriation for the Army compare with the appropriations of other nations?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Our appropriations are comparatively larger than theirs.

Mr. LUCKEY. How does the gentleman explain the fact we are so unprepared when we are spending more than other nations?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Because our standard of living is so high.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. When we in this country appropriate \$370,000,000 it is about equivalent to the Japanese Government appropriating 150,000,000 yen, because the boiler workers or the manufacturer of bombs, munitions, or other implements of war in Japan can get along on 1 yen a day, and that is what their workers are paid, 1 yen a day on a gold basis; but we pay our people higher wages than that; we pay them what we feel is a living, ample wage.

So whatever we procure in the Army costs more. The subsistence of our Army costs more than it does other nations. Therefore, you cannot use figures and say that we are spending more for national defense than some other nation. You have to consider the problem comparatively. Of course, our dollar buys much less when we spend it for national defense than the French franc equivalently or the Italian lire, or the British pound, for that matter. Everything is more costly to us when we secure procurement for national defense. That is about the answer. When figures are quoted alone they are not true and do not present the entire picture.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go now to the subject of seacoast defense. For the first time in many years there will be found a substantial item in this appropriation bill for seacoast defenses. Starting on page 13 of the report, that subject is discussed. Away back in 1895 the Endicott Board determined what kind and character of seacoast defenses this Nation should have. That is, the type of fixed defenses which guard the port cities on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. About 30 years ago a certain type of defense was installed on the Pacific coast at Bremerton, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego. Those defenses, of course, have grown obsolete in many particulars. An automobile of 30 years ago would look pretty old as compared with the automobile of today.

Most of the members of the subcommittee went out this summer at an inconvenience to themselves, may I say, after the long session of Congress last year, and made a tour of parts of the Ninth and Eighth Corps area. The Ninth Corps area covers all of the Pacific Coast States, while the Eighth Corps area covers the States beyond the Middle West and lying just east of the Ninth Corps area. We inspected barracks and fortifications. We climbed up and down such fortifications. We visited munition depots. We went everywhere we possibly could from 8 o'clock in the morning until 4:30 in the evening. After that study we determined that something should be done which should have priority. As a result it was determined that we should follow the plan which has been on file and perfected by the War Department. It was determined that we would rehabilitate and modernize the Pacific coast defenses. There will be found in this appropriation bill now an item of \$3,000,000 to commence rehabilitation of the fortifications at all the port cities along the Pacific coast. There will be found an extra \$3,000,000 for the Hawaiian department and a substantial sum for the Panama Canal.

Mr. Chairman, 25 years ago I was a young man in Los Angeles when the fortifications at Fort McArthur were installed. I am only speaking comparatively to show how the Los Angeles territory has grown in importance and how our establishments should be defended against an enemy so that the fleet may be free to render aid and the mobile forces of infantry may be used somewhere else, all of which should not be at home defending the cities and the properties around the cities. There were perhaps about 350,000 souls in the county of Los Angeles. Today there are approximately two and a half million souls in the same county. There are in storage at that point—known as the Los Angeles basin—100,000,000 barrels of oil. Industrially we have increased. So has the great area around the bay of San Francisco. The fortifications were placed there to protect these areas. Today we commence a fresh program I am pleased to note. Starting this year we are going to spend a little money to improve and modernize these coast defenses. The program will take about 5 years. But at the

end of that time, at a cost of a little over \$15,000,000, every single person who lives in the coastal city areas may feel comfortable and repose in a state of security should any emergency arise.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. From what source or from what Nation does the gentleman expect an attack, upon, we will say the gentleman's gasoline resources in the Pacific coast cities?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I am happy the gentleman asked that question, because if he will read history he will find there really no good reasons for most wars. War is illogical.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. The gentleman cannot ask logically why any war is going to come, or why it has happened in the past. It is just a question of emotion.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. The gentleman has not answered the question.

Mr. COLDEN. The gentleman ought to know the answer to that question himself.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of making a few observations and propounding a few inquiries. In the Washington Post this morning appears an article by the Associated Press under this heading, "Hagood asks Army be given some of W. P. A. 'stage money'."

Quoting from this article, I read:

Congress received advice yesterday from Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood to take advantage of what he called "a lot of easy money floating around"—including "stage money from the W. P. A."—and use it to improve living conditions at Army posts.

Further along in the article I read as follows:

The major general said he was "not familiar with the various pockets in which Uncle Sam keeps his money" but that he understood "there is Budget money, which is very hard to get; there is P. W. A. money, which is not so hard to get; and then there is a vast quantity of W. P. A. money, which is very easy to get for trifling projects but almost impossible to get for anything worthwhile."

I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the general knew when he made the statements accredited to him, if he did make them, that he was denouncing officers of our military organization, though not of quite such high rank as the general himself, because I have here a memorandum with reference to the officers of the Corps of Engineers on duty with the Works Progress Administration, including the Assistant Administrator and Chief Engineer, assistant to the Chief Engineer, another assistant to the Chief Engineer, and then military officers in the six different regions, and there are 41 of these engineering officers of the Army thus assigned to the W. P. A.

I understand, furthermore, that those officers who have control of these regions pass upon the projects in the various States and deny them or approve them. If this be true, then Major General Hagood is indicting his own organization in the accusations which he makes.

Now, I want to propound a few inquiries. I should like to know, in the first place, if any gentleman on the committee can give me the information, how many officers we have in the Engineering Corps of the Army.

Mr. PARKS. I cannot give the gentleman the information right off, but the information is in the hearings, and I shall refer to them and give the gentleman the number a little later.

Mr. LANHAM. I could not find the information in the hearings.

I should like to know also whether or not these officers are needed in the Engineer Corps of the Army.

If they are needed in carrying on military work, then why should they be diverted to civilian undertakings that are supposed to give employment to civilian engineers in this country? Here are 41 of them not engaged in Army work.

I want the Army to have all the engineers it needs for competent and efficient service, but it seems to me we are going pretty far afield when we go to our Army for our official personnel for W. P. A. projects for several reasons: Not only that these men displace competent engineers in civilian life but also because of the fact that the projects undertaken by the W. P. A. are not of a character that require military engineering. They require, on the contrary, civil engineering.

Mr. PARKS. If the gentleman will permit, on page 64 of the hearings he will find that the officers of the Engineering Corps on October 31, 1935, numbered 459.

Mr. LANHAM. I assume those officers are needed for the work of the Army; and if so, why should 41 of them—almost 10 percent—be diverted to take the place of civilian engineers in the operation and administration of projects which have to do with civilian construction?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The thing I object to, too, when you go down to these Army engineers in W. P. A. you have to salute them and click your heels, or you do not get anything.

Mr. LANHAM. Well, I have not had occasion to consult or confer with any of these officers. I feel sure they are courteous gentlemen. I do not think they are specially trained in civilian engineering, and I think they are out of place when they are placed in the W. P. A., displacing competent civilian engineers in the administration of civilian projects.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. McSWAIN. The gentleman realizes that these officers did not detail themselves to this work, neither were they detailed at the request of the War Department. They were requested by these emergency administrations because of the fact that being not only Army engineers having to do with field fortifications, and so on, but civil engineers of great experience, they have had in charge such great works as our rivers and harbors, flood control, and projects of that sort.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to my friend that I have nothing to say in disparagement of these gentlemen or of their efficiency, but I do think they are out of place. They are not working here to any great extent with rivers and harbors; they are working rather with road construction and things of that character, not military roads but civilian roads, and I think that if we need the number of engineers in the Army that has been cited, there must be work in the Army for these engineers to do, and they are out of place in directing and placing under military supervision civilian undertakings of the Government.

Now, I am a friend of the Army. I want it to have all the engineers it needs, but I think they should keep their place and do their engineering work with reference to military projects and undertakings.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a very brief interruption?

Mr. LANHAM. I will; yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. As I read the statements of General Hagood in the papers this morning it struck me they bordered on disrespect, if not contempt, for the administration. This was the first reaction I got from his statements. I did not know that Army officers were permitted to refer in such a disrespectful and contemptuous way to the Government of the United States.

Mr. LANHAM. I will say to my friend that also the general probably did not know that he was reflecting upon men in his own military organization who hold high rank, because here are 41 men connected with this work and they are all officers of the Army.

I have no reflections to cast upon Major General Hagood. I think he is a most competent and efficient officer, but I think we certainly ought to look with some degree of mis-

giving upon extending further, as suggested by General Hagood, the military operations of this civilian organization.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. The gentleman refers to diversion of military personnel to W. P. A. and P. W. A. projects. Does not the gentleman think that the diversion of P. W. A. funds to military and naval objectives is even more dangerous, in view of the fact that the American people and the English people—the Anglo-Saxon people—have always insisted upon maintaining control over defensive funds in the hands of their legislative bodies?

Mr. LANHAM. That is probably true; but, of course, that is a little apart from the thought I had in mind. My thought was that if these men are needed in the Army their field of operation is in the military service.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FADDIS. I might suggest to the gentleman that in all probability a great many of these engineers are engineers who are concerned with the upkeep of the rivers, and some of this emergency work has to do with the revetment of banks, and so forth, along the rivers; and, therefore, they would properly belong in that field.

Mr. LANHAM. May I bring it to the attention of the gentleman that there are six regions in the United States, all of which cannot be primarily concerned with rivers and harbors, and all of which are under the supervision and control of these Army officers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and incorporate therein the report from General Valdes, of the Philippine Constabulary.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to discuss briefly the bill before us, namely, one which makes the appropriation for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year of 1937. The bill carries a proposed expenditure of nearly \$375,000,000 for military activities, compared to about \$379,000,000 recommended for military activities in the same bill last year. While I strongly favor adequate defense, I wish to join other Members of the House in a plea for economy and elimination of useless expenditure of taxpayers' money in time of peace. I will not discuss here the merits or reason for spending this gigantic sum of money during peacetime, leaving that to others who will debate the question on those issues. I have studied the hearings of the subcommittee with a great deal of interest, and I wish to confine my remarks to the question of whether or not—in view of the fact that we have just returned from the Philippine Islands where we attended the inauguration of the Philippine Commonwealth—we should begin to reduce the heavy expenditures for the maintenance of our military establishment in the Philippine Islands. Excepting the item for the activities of the Philippine High Commissioner, which will be found on page 65 of the bill, very little information is given in the bill or the hearings as to the actual amount of money we are spending today in those islands, which in 10 years from now will be free and independent. On page 136 of the hearings will be found references entitled "Pay of Philippine Scouts." The gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable THOMAS McMILLAN, apparently took a deep interest in this item, and while his questions were not meant as a criticism, he indicated that this question was of vital importance to him and must be settled sometime in the future. Partly because of my colleague's interest in this matter, and because I have recently returned from those islands, where I made a study of certain conditions, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the fact that we today are

spending huge sums of money to maintain our Army in those far-away islands. I believe the presence of our Army in the Philippine Islands at this time may become a menace to the future independence of the Filipino people, and I sincerely believe that our Army should be withdrawn in order to give the Philippine Government a real opportunity to carry out the intent of the transition period.

How expensive the maintenance of our Army in the Philippines is to the taxpayers of the United States is a matter of much concern to me. There are 6,386 enlisted Scouts and 52 Philippine Scout officers in the Philippine Islands at this time drawing pay from the United States Treasury. Besides that there are 4,317 American enlisted men and 535 Regular American Army officers on the Philippines drawing pay from the United States Treasury. Besides that there are 55 warrant officers and 42 nurses in the Philippines, also drawing pay from the United States Government.

The officers of the Regular Army and the Philippine Scouts for the fiscal year 1935 drew, in salary alone, \$2,056,829.

The army nurses drew \$69,469.

The warrant officers drew \$129,775.

The American enlisted men drew \$1,680,360.

The Philippine Scout enlisted men drew \$1,210,199.

This makes a total of \$5,146,631 which we paid to our standing Army in the Philippine Islands last year.

Of course, this does not include the tremendous amount of money we spend every year to transport officers and enlisted men and their families to and from the Philippine Islands, nor does it take in the maintenance of military equipment and buildings and other expenses.

The foregoing statistics may be supplemented by the following facts: Of the 535 officers of the Regular Army assigned to duty in the Philippine Islands as of November 30, 1935, 278 are on duty with the Regular Army of the United States and 257 are on duty with the Philippine Scouts.

The average value in property of barracks, quarters, and so forth, appurtenant to the Military Establishment in the Philippine Islands is \$14,165,828, upon which there is incurred an annual cost for repairs, and so forth, of \$956,070. The estimated average value of military equipment in use in the Philippines and in reserve is \$40,624,317. The estimated annual cost of transporting passengers and cargo to and from the Philippine Islands on account of our military activities there is \$880,678. It is estimated that the annual lump-sum total expended in the operations of the Philippine department for the fiscal year of 1935 amounted to \$11,257,893.

I wish to go on record at this time and make the statement that in my personal belief the people of the Philippine Islands are better equipped for complete independence today than were our forefathers when we took this land away from Great Britain. The majority of the people in the Philippine Islands want independence; they believe that the United States has promised them independence and they are entitled to all of the help and assistance we can give them toward their present objective—complete independence at the expiration of this 10 years of commonwealth government. We have promised these people their independence, and because I believe like other Members of Congress that the word of Uncle Sam is good, we should not place any obstacles in the way of the Philippine people toward gaining their objective. I believe that by keeping a large and expensive armed force of our soldiers and officers in those islands at this particular time will obstruct Filipino independence, and their presence there may become an implement of use to certain politicians who may use the presence of our armed forces in the Philippine Islands for their personal political advancement. Members of the House should know that these Philippine Scouts are native Filipinos and could easily be absorbed in the Philippine Army, which is being organized under the guidance of that well-qualified Army officer, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. This is not only my own opinion but the opinion of some of our very able Army officers who today are living in the Philippine Islands and who believe that if we are really going to carry out our promise and give the Filipino people their

independence we should aid them by eliminating the presence of our Army at a time when they are endeavoring to make their own army efficient.

Members of the House should know that for over 30 years American soldiers and Philippine Scouts paid by the United States Treasury have taken absolutely no part in the defense of the Philippines; have had no experience in any battle whatsoever in the Philippine Islands, nor have they participated within a quarter of a century in maintaining peace within the borders of the Philippine Islands. Their entire activity during a quarter of a century has been that of drilling or detached duty. This is not said with the view of casting any reflections as to ability or high standing or character of the officers and men of the Philippine Islands. Some of the Army officers discussing the removal of our own men and the amalgamating of Philippine Scouts with the native troops, state that these officers and soldiers would have to serve somewhere and that the Philippine Islands is just as good a place as any for them to be stationed. Other officers, however, whose motives cannot be questioned, call attention to the fact that these officers and men could be used within the borders of the United States and a tremendous amount of money could be saved in transportation and maintenance in idleness nearly 10,000 miles away from home.

Members of the House of Representatives interested in the Philippine Islands and their eventual complete independence should study something of the history of that great organization known as the Philippine Constabulary, which for more than a quarter of a century has preserved law and order and successfully met all contingencies without any assistance from United States troops stationed in the Philippine Islands. This organization of Filipino natives was organized under American auspices. It was the new army created by the Philippine Commission, as the new civil government in the Philippines was called when it was organized in 1901.

Originally its enlisted strength was native. Its senior chiefs were officers of the United States Army, and the remainder of its commission strength was made up of the best of American volunteers who remained in the islands after the civil government was established. A few Filipino officers entered the lower commission grades, and these have increased in strength until this constabulary is commissioned by practically all native officers. Today this constabulary has an actual strength of 6,570 enlisted highly drilled soldiers and 412 officers. It is commanded by Brig. Gen. Basilio J. Valdaes, who is one of the most outstanding officials of the Philippine Archipelago, with a long history of valuable service to the American Government during the World War. The Philippine Constabulary, with its West Point of the Philippines located at Baguio, the summer capital of the islands, has gone through a baptism of terrible odds, due to much jealousy on the part of better equipped and better financed military organizations. It has won its mark of distinction through the bravery and heroism of American officers and enlisted men, until today, due to that active service of a quarter of a century, it is considered by military experts as one of the most effective military organizations in the world.

Members of this House should also know that in the Philippine Islands today there is an organization called the National Volunteers of the Philippine Islands, commanded by that fine gentleman, Panfilo Laconico, which has in its membership 100,000 men, ranging in age from 18 to 45 years, uniformed and drilled, and sworn to uphold and protect the Constitutions of the United States of America and the Philippine Islands and all organized law and order, and dedicated to Philippine freedom. Its membership can be found in every Province of the Philippine Islands. Besides this, in the Philippine Islands, there are cadet organizations, Boy Scouts, and university military groups, and with compulsory military training, and through the advice of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the military adviser of the Philippines, it will be easily seen that so far as protecting itself internally the Filipino people have not only been able to successfully combat this question for a quarter of a century but are well on the

road toward the organization of further unifying the entire citizenship toward the future internal safety of those islands.

Therefore, the brief reference to the pay of the Philippine Scouts in the hearings of the War Department appropriation bill becomes very important today, and I feel it my duty to call attention of Members of this House to my belief that the longer we maintain an expensive American Army in the Philippine Islands, the longer the menace to eventual Philippine independence. In questioning Major Worrall on the matter of pay of the enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts, my colleague, Mr. McMILLAN, asks this question:

What effect, if any, will the independence of the Philippine Islands have on this project?

Major WORRALL. That is a matter that will have to be settled prior to the expiration of the 10-year period.

Mr. McMILLAN. Has that subject been considered at all?

Major WORRALL. I think it has been taken up, but what decisions have been reached I do not know. Of course, that will be some years from now, and these men are all putting in time toward retirement. Whether they will continue enlistments for that service, or what the situation will be, I could not tell you. But they are still a part of the American Army.

Mr. McMILLAN. That will be a subject for consideration at some time, of course.

Major WORRALL. Yes, sir; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is why I mention it now.

Major WORRALL. They are largely officered by Philippine Scouts also, although there are some Americans in command.

Mr. McMILLAN. My inquiry is not meant as a criticism at all, but it must be settled sometime in the future.

Last October I, with other members of the Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives and some Members of the United States Senate, left Seattle for the Philippine Islands as guests of the Philippine people to attend the inauguration of the Philippine Commonwealth. I was among other members of the party who before sailing from Seattle made brief addresses of farewell to the American people, during which we stated that we were on our way to cross the Pacific Ocean to attend the birth of a new nation. The question of Philippine independence had been sealed insofar as actual independence is concerned, because every one of us before sailing were under the impression that the United States had passed the Tydings-McDuffie Act and that at the end of the 10-year transition period the American flag would come down, the Philippine flag would be raised, and there would be actual independence for the Filipino people. Yet before we were many miles on the high seas arguments were placed before us to the effect that the Filipinos were not prepared for independence and never would be prepared for independence. Before, during, and after the great inaugural program, during which Filipino people were lauded to the skies by American orators; during which the "promise of America is good" and that "Uncle Sam never goes back on his word", many members were bombarded with additional arguments that these natives can never govern themselves. So by the time our ship left for home many members felt that our voyage to the Philippines was not to attend the birth of a new nation.

So it was not surprising to receive on the high seas the wireless report to the effect that Mr. Roy Howard, representing the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Syndicate, had issued a statement to the effect that Philippine independence is doomed and that Philippine independence is fading, that the launching of the Commonwealth government was gasping its last and that on every side there was evidence that the Philippine Republic, lauded by the Tydings-McDuffie Act, was destined never to materialize. While we have yet to learn the reply to Mr. Howard's statement from President Manuel Quezon, I personally wish to commend to Members of the House the feelings of many Filipino people to the effect that Mr. Howard's statement was at least untimely. The Manila Herald was quick to respond to Mr. Howard's statement with:

The United States Congress has outlined a definite program for us to accomplish, and the most sensible thing for us to do is to set our hearts and souls on it and get it done.

Col. John R. White, who for many years lived in the Philippines and fought and bled to carry out America's plans of bringing liberty to the Filipino people, stated some years ago that the fitness of the Filipinos for independence is not the only consideration, but in fairness to the Filipinos the general economic and political

necessities of the Pacific should be considered on one page and the Filipino fitness should be on another page, and that it would be wrong to mix these two pages and do injustice to a people of as many virtues as ourselves and, perhaps, not more vices.

Long before the Tydings-McDuffie Act was passed, this hero of many battles in the Philippine Islands against insurrectos and ladrones, in his book entitled "Bullets and Bolos", which should be read by every Member of Congress, indicated that it was a thankless task to make the Filipinos safe, healthy, and prosperous. How could we—

Then little versed in history or philosophy, know that happiness would not follow; that the Filipino people or that element among them strongest lunged would rather be unsafe and poverty-stricken under their own flag than everything that was good under the Star-Spangled Banner.

And yet the task has not been a thankless one as witnessed by the comradeship and pride established by the Filipinos and Americans.

I am speaking today not so much on the question of Philippine independence, which I believe is a closed chapter, as I am in preserving the promise of the United States to these people and at the same time endeavoring to call attention of Members of this House toward the necessity of economy in the spending of taxpayers' money. More especially do I wish to repeat my belief that the maintaining of an expensive army in the Philippines at a time when the Filipino people do not need it represents not only waste of taxpayers' money but a serious menace in the path of the independence we have promised to the people of the Philippine Islands.

I spent some years in the Philippine Islands 30 years ago, and I have more or less kept in contact with some of the people there. During my recent visit to those islands I made it my duty to study the improvement that had been made there during the lapse of these many years. I cannot complete my address without paying a tribute to the officers and men who gave their lives in the service under our flag in the early struggles in the Philippines—the men who never came back and whose remains are buried in some of the cemeteries and swamps of those islands. It was my privilege to lay a wreath on the graves of American soldiers as my humble tribute to their services; and, viewing the great improvements 30 years later, I hope that their sacrifice years ago has not been in vain. Eliminating disease, bringing health, great highways, and modern transportation, and, above all, education to a helpless people, is a tribute to American generosity which I believe is appreciated by the rank and file of the people of the Philippine Islands. My contact with the Filipino people indicated that 90 percent of them want their independence, and they believe that Uncle Sam's promise is good enough for them. The masterful address of our beloved Speaker, the Honorable Joseph W. Byrns, the addresses of our Vice President, the Honorable John N. Garner, the Secretary of War, Mr. Dern, and others at the inaugural ceremonies all contained messages of cheer and assurances to these people that complete independence for the Filipino people was at the end of the road of this 10-year transition period.

The Philippine Islands are rich in natural resources, rich in mineral, lumber, gold, grain, sugar, copra, and so forth, and yet, in my opinion, they are not necessary to our United States. On the contrary, they are an expensive possession. I personally believe that the Japanese scare is one which has been overdone by the anti-independence advocates and that it will be many, many years before Japan, with its hands full of the Russian menace in China, can turn its eyes to the acquisition of the Philippine Islands. The neutralization of the Philippines, in my opinion, is the answer to all of those who today feel that the strong arm and the purse of Uncle Sam must be perpetually extended across the 10,000 miles over to the Philippine Archipelago. I believe in the statement of Maj. William C. Rivers, who spent many years in the Philippine Islands, when he says, "Yes; there is something out there, staying out there in the Philippines for us—a big war, and for what earthly use?"

In closing my address I wish to state that the question of Philippine independence is one that has been closed, and the

time has arrived for the American people to realize it and give the Filipino people every encouragement to work out their own salvation and eliminate all menaces which may in any way become detrimental to the ultimate carrying out of our promise to the people of the Philippine Islands. Give the common man of the Philippine Archipelago the opportunity of majority rule, such as we enjoy in these United States. This common man of the Philippine Islands can never put into effect majority rule if we put obstacles in his way. [Applause.]

During the address of Mr. STEFAN the following occurred: Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. Several newspapers have stated that it would be difficult to maintain the independence of the Philippine Islands, and the gentleman, I know, has studied the situation, and I think the information that he could give us would be valuable.

Mr. STEFAN. I am glad the gentleman has asked the question. I am not discussing Philippine independence, I am discussing the economy and expenditure of money during peace times. We attended the inauguration of the commonwealth, and the following day the Manila Bulletin reported the story by Roy Howard.

In answering the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU], I will state that on December 11, the Manila Daily Bulletin printed an Associated Press story dated South Bend, Ind., describing the visit to Notre Dame University by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, which read partly as follows:

President Roosevelt accepting an honorary degree from Notre Dame University, lifted the great torch of liberty, of human thought, and liberty of human conscience for the guidance of other nations if they will accept it.

The occasion was a special convocation commemorating the Philippine Commonwealth. The same story quotes our President as follows:

We are here to welcome the commonwealth. I consider it one of the happiest events of my office to have signed my name to the instrument which will give national freedom to the Filipino people.

Hardly had the echoes of the independence celebration died down in Manila and the congressional party well on its way back home on the Pacific Ocean, than every newspaper in Manila was filled with stories to the effect that Roy Howard had published a story which was carried in all of the Scripps-Howard newspapers and practically all other newspapers in our country to the effect that Philippine independence is doomed. The Filipinos, who had believed that we had just witnessed the celebration of a birth of a new nation, were aghast over that statement. I hope this explanation answers the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. Yes; that answers the question. I wish to thank the gentleman from Nebraska for the explanation.

Mr. STEFAN. By leave given me, I insert some excerpts from newspapers sent to me from Manila. This is from the Manila Herald of December 11, 1935, by Roy W. Howard, editor of the New York World-Telegram and chairman of the board of the Scripps-Howard newspapers:

MANILA, December 10.—The Filipino dream of independence is fading fast. Today, within 1 month after the launching of the Commonwealth government, the 35-year-old major issue of island politicians is gasping its last. On every side there is evidence a plenty that the Filipino Republic as contemplated by the Tydings-McDuffie law, and as demanded by political leaders from Aguinaldo to Quezon, is destined never to materialize.

Following are excerpts from the Manila Herald, Philippine Islands, of December 11, 1935:

CONFESOR PROMISES TO EXPLODE IN ASSEMBLY THIS AFTERNOON

Political and educational figures today alternately boiled, beamed, and boomed in expressing their varied reactions to Editor Roy Howard's article declaring that Philippine independence was doomed because the Filipinos no longer desired it.

President Manuel L. Quezon was reported this noon as studying the article carefully and planning to comment on it possibly within a few days.

Assemblyman Tomas Confesor declared that if Howard's statement is true, then there must be a well-organized and well-

financed conspiracy among some politicians, businessmen, financiers, and educators to frustrate independence under the independence law. Mr. Confesor announced that he will deliver a speech in the assembly this afternoon on the Howard article.

UNTIMELY

The least that could be said of Mr. Roy Howard's statement, to the effect, more or less, that Philippine independence is doomed, is that it is very untimely.

The United States Congress has outlined a definite program for us to accomplish, and the most sensible thing for us to do is to set our hearts and souls on it and get it done.

If we get busy now and do our part of the job, we will merit the admiration and respect of the American people; if we lie supinely on our backs, if we show fear instead of courage, we will deserve but pity and contempt.

SENATORS, ROOSEVELT, AND OTHERS DISCUSS FUTURE OF ISLANDS

WASHINGTON, December 10.—The declaration of Roy W. Howard, chairman of the board of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, that there was a change of heart in the Philippines with respect to complete independence attracted wide attention in the United States today and drew varied response.

THE POLITICAL FRONT

Publisher and Editor Roy W. Howard says that Philippine independence is doomed. He said a mouthful. The political front was agog and aghast over his statement. Sensible legislators, in general, commented against the statement, but with a wink of an eye. Howard is right from the point of view of a few and powerful businessmen. But he is certainly wrong if you ask the simple and rustic farmers out in the provinces, where they have fashioned their own peculiar dream of political liberty. Economics is now the ruler of the world and business is its prime minister. Howard may be right.

By leave given me, Mr. Chairman, I submit the following information regarding the Philippine Constabulary, written by Brigadier General Valdes, Chief of the Philippine Constabulary:

[Second endorsement]

HEADQUARTERS, PHILIPPINE CONSTABULARY,

Manila, September 28, 1934.

Respectfully returned to Mr. Jas. A. P. Henderson through the secretary of the Governor General.

The Philippine Constabulary is the armed force of the Government of the Philippine Islands, established and maintained for the preservation of peace, law, and order within the islands. Its Commander in Chief is the Governor General, who, through the Chief of Constabulary, exercises general supervision and control of its administration, including all matters pertaining to appointments, assignments, promotion, discipline, and field operations. For administrative purposes the Constabulary is designated a bureau with the Chief as director, under the Department of the Interior. Officers and enlisted men of the Constabulary are vested with police powers and are authorized to prevent and suppress brigandage, unlawful assemblies, and other breaches of the peace and violations of law. They are required to execute any lawful warrant or order of arrest for violation of law and to make arrests without warrant upon reasonable suspicion.

COMMISSIONED SERVICE

Commissioned officers are those having the following rank: (a) general officer: brigadier general; (b) line officers: captain, first lieutenant, second lieutenant, and third lieutenant. In each grade relative rank is determined by date of commission or appointment, except in the case of officers who have, for disciplinary reasons, been reduced in files.

The chief and assistant chiefs of constabulary are appointed by the Governor General, by and with the consent of the Philippine Senate. All other officers are, subject to the approval of the Governor General, appointed or promoted by the chief. Original vacancies in the commissioned ranks are filled by the appointment of graduates of the Constabulary Academy. Appointments may also be made of graduates of an accredited school or university, having organized military training as a feature of its curriculum, and whose educational standard and requirements are equal to those of a high school, or of candidates who have qualified for admission to the United States Military or Naval Academy or of officers of the Organized Reserve of the United States Army; or of honorable discharged noncommissioned officers of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps; or the Philippine Constabulary, who have had 1 or more years of service as noncommissioned officers: *Provided*, That the candidate herein referred shall have qualified in a written examination on the subject required by law, and shall have been certified upon by the faculty of the Constabulary Academy as having graduated from a successful course of instructions therein. Promotion in the grades of lieutenant are made by seniority provided that every third promotion may be made by selection through merits in the discretion of the chief. Promotions in the grades higher than first lieutenant are made exclusively through merits of the officers. Eligibility for promotion shall be determined by examination in the subjects prescribed by regulations, except that third lieutenants who are graduates of the Constabulary Academy are exempted from examination for promotion to the next higher grade. Officers who

failed in three consecutive examinations are required to relinquish their commission unless, in the opinion of the chief, the good of the service requires or justifies their retention. Officers are assigned to districts or may be transferred from one district to another by the chief. Assignment of officers to companies are made by the district commanders.

ENLISTED SERVICE

The enlisted service is classified in the following grades: (1) Sergeant major, (2) staff sergeant, (3) first sergeant, (4) sergeant, (5) corporal, (6) lance corporal, and (7) private. Sergeant major and staff sergeant are appointed from grade of sergeants by the chief. Promotion of enlisted men of the line in the noncommissioned grades below that of staff sergeant are made by district commanders from lists of eligibles furnished them by company commanders through regular channels, which are revised on January 1 and July 1 of each year and at other times when the exigencies of the service so demand. Noncommissioned officers reduced to the grade of privates by sentence of summary court may not be advanced within 6 months from date of such sentence.

ENLISTMENT

Any male citizen of the Philippine Islands who has taken oath of allegiance to the United States, between 18 and 35 years of age, able-bodied, free from disease, of good moral character and habits, of average intelligence, and possessed of such educational attainments as may be prescribed from time to time in orders may be enlisted in the service. Enlistment is for a term of 3 years. Minors between 18 and 21 years of age may be enlisted only with written consent of the father, the mother when she is the only surviving parent, or the publicly known guardian. Enlistment of the following persons is prohibited: Deserters or men dishonorably discharged in the constabulary, military, or naval forces of the United States; men whose former service was not honest and faithful; men who have been discharged for physical disability or as unsuited to the service; men with criminal records; and members of the United States Army Reserve. Applicants for enlistment or reenlistment are examined physically by medical officer.

REENLISTMENT

Men of all grades who reenlist, or shall have reenlisted within 2 months after date of discharge, provided discharge was by reason of expiration of term of enlistment, shall receive \$2 per month additional pay for first reenlistment and \$1 per month additional pay for their second and each subsequent reenlistment. Noncommissioned officers who do not reenlist on the day following discharge may subsequently be reenlisted only as privates.

FURLOUGH

Furlough for a period of 30 days may be granted by company or detachment commanders to men who reenlist on the day following their discharge if the furlough be spent within the Province; if the furlough is spent outside the Province approval of the provincial commander is first obtained. Furlough of over 30 days has to be approved by the chief or district commanders.

HONORABLE DISCHARGE

Enlisted men will be honorably discharged (a) at the expiration of the term of enlistment, (b) by order of the chief or of the district commander of the district in which the man is serving in the following cases: (1) Upon his written application for good and sufficient reason, (2) for reasons of unsuitability for constabulary service, and (3) for physical or mental disability not contracted in line of duty.

DISHONORABLE DISCHARGE

An enlisted man may be dishonorably discharged by (1) order of the chief or by order of the district commander of the district in which the enlisted man is serving after a third conviction by a summary court within 1 year, (2) by order of the chief after conviction by a civil court.

PENSION AND RETIREMENT LAW

The administrative code of the Philippine Islands provides for the pension and retirement fund of the Philippine Constabulary. Pensions may be paid from this fund for the benefit of widows and orphans of members of the constabulary who lose their lives in line of duty and for members of the constabulary who become incapacitated to gain a livelihood by reason of wounds or other causes contracted while in the service. To the pension fund shall accrue (1) all fines and forfeitures imposed by summary courts; (2) all fines imposed upon commissioned officers; (3) 4 percent of the pay of every officer and enlisted man of the constabulary, which shall be deducted from said pay monthly; and (4) all sums accruing from vacancies in the authorized strength of officers and enlisted men, together with all other savings from positions the occupants thereof are or shall be entitled to the benefits of the constabulary pension and retirement funds.

Pensions are granted in cases of (a) death; (b) disability from wounds received in line of duty; (c) disability from disease contracted in line of duty; (d) total disability; (e) completion of 20 or more years of actual and satisfactory service and to those who have attained the age of 55 years, or who, without having reached said age, is on account of his physical or mental condition prevented from continuing in active service, may retire from active service upon approval of the Governor General, and when so retired he shall receive until his death from the funds an annual pension equal to 2½ percent for each year of active service rendered by him to date of the total pay received annually by him on the date of his retirement, but in no case more than 75 percent of such total current pay. With the exception of the

chief, no officer shall be retained in active service after having attained the age of 64 years.

In addition to the insular constabulary, local peace and order is maintained by members of the municipal police force. Before a person may be appointed member of the police force he must first qualify in an appropriate examination given by the police board. Qualifications for taking the examination are fixed by law and include, among others, the following:

- (a) Sound physical condition.
 - (b) Age, not below 18 and not over 40 years of age.
 - (c) No criminal records.
 - (d) Must not have been dishonorably discharged from the Army, Navy, or Philippine Constabulary.
 - (e) Must speak and write the vernacular.
- Appointments are made from the list of eligibles by the local municipal presidents with the consent of the municipal council. Once appointed a member of the local police cannot be separated except for cause or by resignation.

BASILLO J. VALDES,
Brigadier General, Chief of Constabulary.

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] a moment ago made some remarks concerning the functions of the United States Engineers, and by inference, perhaps, suggested that they were ousting their civilian brethren. That, of course, is an old story. That story has been told in the present administration and it was told during the days when the President of my party was in the White House. The attempt to unhorse the Army Engineers has never reached first base and, while this Congress functions, it never will. Mr. Chairman, the United States Engineers are the most distinguished public servants of this Nation. They are so outstanding that they are in a class by themselves.

During 8 years' service on the Rivers and Harbors Committee I have been amazed at the work of the Army Engineers. The efficiency and devotion of this group to the cause of America is, in large part, the basis of our national development. The future engineers were the intellectual leaders at West Point. Under the stress and discipline of that system they were the dominating mental and physical types and as such were selected for the engineering service. Originally the engineers pioneered the West, built railroads, bridges, and performed other notable service in peacetime. It is, of course, a combatant branch of the United States Army in times of war. One who knows them well has written of them:

Our Government requires the services of engineers who combine high professional qualifications in the above lines with esprit, personal probity, and complete freedom from political influence which the officer possesses.

The Nation has expended hundreds of millions of dollars for pioneering purposes, for the improvement of rivers and harbors, and for flood control. This work has been highly technical in character, requiring the exercise of the highest engineering skill. It has all been accomplished successfully, and the Nation, which hears little of this group of technicians, has reaped incalculable economic benefits from their work. It is interesting to note that while all the millions of dollars appropriated for these purposes, running beyond the billion mark, has been expended under the direction of the engineers, there has been but one case of peculation in 110 years of this service. The engineers are the real field marshals of the public domain. They combine extraordinary industry and power of research with the highest order of intellect. Through my services on the Rivers and Harbors Committee I have been brought in contact with this group of remarkable public servants and have been amazed by the breadth and clarity of their findings on all questions concerning waterways and economics.

The Corps of Engineers numbered among its membership Gen. Robert E. Lee, Gen. George B. McClellan, and a host of other soldiers hardly less distinguished. These men partook of and added to the traditions of this body of men. The suggestion coming from the gentleman that these men usurp some of the functions of some civilian group is, of course, a mistaken suggestion. The fact is that the Army Engineers are more perfectly equipped to perform the service they do perform than any civilian body could ever be.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. CULKIN. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. The gentleman also realizes that, by reason of the fact that the Army Engineers perform this useful service in times of peace, that branch of the Army at least is eliminated from the criticism that the Army is but a body of tax eaters waiting during all the years of peace for service in time of war. If it were possible for all of the other branches to be as usefully, advantageously, and economically employed for the good of the country, it would eliminate much of the criticism of the expense of the Military Establishment as a whole.

Mr. CULKIN. What the gentleman says is true, and I thank him for his contribution. What I want to impress upon the House and the country is that the Engineers of the United States Army form a group of economists who have no peers in any other country in the world. It would be a disastrous day when through the urge of an outside group these extraordinary public servants should be unhorsed so that some few civilians might get jobs. It would be disastrous to America in time of peace and equally harmful to America in time of war.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. Yes.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Was not the builder of the Panama Canal one of these great engineers—Colonel Goethals?

Mr. CULKIN. Yes; and with all deference to the distinguished civilian engineer who preceded him, it was Colonel Goethals, the Army engineer, and his associates in the Engineer Corps who took over the job and pushed it to completion. But that is just one phase of their remarkable service. May I say this: If at the outset of this depression, when the spending of the \$3,000,000,000 began and then the spending of the \$4,000,000,000 continued, our distinguished President had laid the proposition of spending this money in the lap of the Army Engineers, now under the leadership of that great economist, General Markham, then indeed would that money have been well spent and in the interest of future generations. It would have been spent for posterity by men who have the national outlook and, indeed, have the true national eye.

I did not rise particularly to call the attention of the House to the services and worth of the Army Engineers. The remarks of the gentleman who preceded me made them necessary. What I rose to call attention to is the need of decent housing for our military forces in America. The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], whom I greatly admire, called attention to some extracts of a statement of General Hagood before the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations.

General Hagood said in that same statement, with reference to the housing conditions that exist in the service, that since returning from the World War he has seen families of soldiers and civilian employees of the Army living under conditions worse than anything he saw among the Belgian refugees. This article in the Washington Post further quotes General Hagood as saying:

I cite cases of 16 families with only one bathhouse among them, and not even a suitable partition for privacy between the occupants of the different sides.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. In just a moment.

The New York Times this morning carries a statement from this same officer, as follows:

There are fine young white girls and boys, children of worthy noncommissioned officers, who have been born and raised under living conditions worse than darky tenements in many a southern State.

What the general said is too true. Adequate housing for the Army has been neglected. I am not going to pass the buck on that to the Military Affairs Committee of the House or to the committee in charge of the pending bill, nor am I going to pass the buck to the Army authorities. I am going to charge them all jointly with responsibility for this condition.

Last year on the floor of this House I called the attention of the Members to conditions existing in two posts within my own district where noncommissioned officers and their families are living in insanitary firetraps. They are housed under conditions that were concurrent with the Mexican War days. Today we come exactly into the situation that we were a year ago. Nothing has been done to cure this disgraceful situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN] has expired.

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CULKIN. There is nothing carried in this bill for military housing. I said a year ago on this floor that the morale of the soldier depends on his environment. If you house him shabbily and inadequately, it matters not how well you may uniform him, how well you may officer him, his environment strikes into his soul, and he is an inadequate soldier.

The gentleman from Texas might well have called attention to the fact that under the present emergency auspices, if you please, some three or four billion dollars, according to some estimates, have gone into the business of raking leaves or moving piles of mud. I wonder if some of the group in charge of these funds are, in fact, surcharged with pacific feelings and hostile to the needs of national defense. When this \$4,800,000,000 was authorized, the Senate wrote in a provision, concurred in by the House, that these moneys might be used for military housing but not for ordnance or armaments. That authority apparently did not reach very far, and today we do not find the Quartermaster General extraordinarily vocal on this subject. We do find this distinguished soldier, Major General Hagood, saying that the conditions are in fact disgraceful. We are spending annually \$400,000,000 upon our land forces. I am for that. I am not one of those who would "Chinify" America. The world was never more national than it is today, and it is no time to talk about reducing our pitifully small land forces. What I do speak for is proper housing for the enlisted men of the land forces. I speak for it earnestly, not alone for the posts in my own district but for all the posts of the Nation. I speak with all the force I can command to the Military Affairs Committee of the House, to this present committee which is charged with this appropriation bill, to the Quartermaster General and others in high command charged with the proper care of the Army, to get busy and cure this situation that amounts to a national scandal. I say it is their function to speak in thunder tones, as General Hagood did, and bring about a correction of this evil condition. If that is not done, if this deplorable environment is permitted to continue in Army posts, an environment probably provocative of a holocaust and many deaths, then, indeed, will that responsibility be upon the staff officers of the Army, the Quartermaster General, this committee, and the Military Affairs Committees of the House and Senate. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN].

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire most sincerely to congratulate the subcommittee on War Department appropriations for the splendid support manifested by their report to an adequate defense program. I only received this report last evening, and, as far as I have been able to glance through the hearings since then, there are only two respects in which I could offer any criticism. Of course, I hope they will be constructive criticisms, and certainly it is friendly criticism.

The first one I desire to call attention to is our serious disappointment in not finding in this bill the money to make operative the provisions of law enacted at the last session under what was known then generally as the Thomason bill. This bill was approved by the President on August 30, 1935. Briefly, that bill provided that 1,000 Reserve officers, and, of course, we understand they would be young, recently graduated in R. O. T. C. units, in the second-lieutenant grade,

should be called to active duty with the Regular Army for 1 year, and at the end of 1 year, after those young officers had been under the observation of the Regular Army officers in the posts, in schools, the Regular Army would pick out from those 1,000 young men only 50 of the choicest material and offer them permanent commissions in the Army.

I want to suggest to you how the sifting process goes on by which we finally find the 50 young men for permanent commissions. First, there are 112,000 young men in all the R. O. T. C. schools throughout the whole Nation. All told, in the lower grades, the first 2 years, and in the senior grades, the last 2 years, there are 112,000. At the end of each year they graduate approximately 7,000 of the 112,000. The cream is first skimmed out of a total of 112,000 into 7,000. Of the 7,000 who graduate, it was the proposal of the law that each year 1,000 of the very best, the most promising young men of the 7,000, would be called by the Regular Army to active duty for 1 year for additional training. How would they be picked? They would be picked by the War Department. Of course, you could not order a young man against his will. Let us assume that of the 7,000 who should finish in any one year only 3,000 would apply for the 1 year's duty. Of course, we know that under conditions as they have obtained in the last 5 or 6 years practically every one of the 7,000 would apply. You know how the young men in your districts have all been insisting, urging, and begging even for 6 months' duty with the C. C. C. But let us say that only 3,000 would actually ask for the duty. The records of those 3,000 go into the War Department. That is, their records as students, how they stood in military duties, their moral characters, their leadership, their personality, and so on. Of the 3,000 the Department selects by this eliminating process 1,000, and you skim the cream again.

Yes, here you skim the cream again. Now you have the cream of the cream, 1,000. Then this 1,000 will be daily on duty in service schools, at posts under the eye of the highly trained regular officer who is marking and grading him and making up his reports all the time. At the end of the year 50 of these only are offered commissions. This 50, then, are the cream of the cream of the cream; and I respectfully submit that these 50 young men would equal any 50 young graduates of any school in any year, because they are selected from such a broad base and by such elimination.

Is there a need for these young men? I call attention to page 5 of the recent report of the Secretary of War wherein in referring to the repeated and constant request of the War Department to increase the officer personnel from 12,000 up to 14,000, something the Army authorities for years and years and years have been insisting on, something upon which hearings have been held, something the War Department officially has been endorsing, it was suggested that the proper way to get these young officers was by a gradual stepping up by annual accretions, because if we took in the whole 2,000 in any one year we would soon have another hump such as the one we tried to get rid of by the promotion bill that was passed last year. In order to meet this deficiency of officers the Congress in its wisdom acted. I admit that they are all wiser than I am; they will remember the bill passed at the last session to increase the cadet strength of the Military Academy by practically 50 percent, giving us each one more cadet, whereas up to that time we had two; but that will not become operative until the first new class under that increase graduates in 1939. The report of our subcommittee refers to this fact and states that there will not be until that time sufficient eliminations, sufficient attrition, as it is called in Army parlance, wearing down or elimination of officer personnel to justify taking in even 50 a year. What are the facts about this? In the first place, the Secretary of War states in his report—this is a solemn report—speaking of graduates of the 1939 class that they will be needed as replacements for officers leaving the active list. By 1939 the normal separations of commissioned officers will have increased so that the number of graduates from the Military Academy will even then be insufficient to meet the vacancies. We know,

of course, they are insufficient now, because we cannot obtain a single additional Military Academy graduate until 1939. If we needed two thousand 5 and 6 years ago, as all studies revealed, we need them now, or at least we ought to begin to add them.

I have from The Adjutant General of the Army an official statement, a correct statement which is true, that for the year and a half ending December 31, 1935—for the whole year 1935 and the last 6 months of 1934—the separations from the service of officers was 806. If the average obtains for the current 6 months there will be during this 6 months 268 separations.

For the 2 years there will be 1,074 separations; and average annual separation will be 535. The graduates from the Military Academy, with the cadet strength of 1,900, will certainly very seldom exceed 400. Why? Because the elimination goes on there, too, due to failure to make grades, dismissals from the service, discharge for health, resignations for various reasons. The graduating class for the last several years has been averaging only about 275. Sometimes it would run up to 300 or more, but the average was between 275 and 300. Multiply this by 50 percent and you will have an average annual increase of approximately 425 or 450. Thus we shall be short about 100 officers at the average rate of attrition going on now. But the Secretary says that by 1939 the benefits offered for retirement under the promotion bill we passed at the last session will be so great that the attrition will be greater than it was during the last 2 years; so instead of 535 losses of officer personnel there may be 600 or more. Where are we going to get the replacements? Many of you have for several years heard me discuss the 50-50 ratio between graduates of the Military Academy, and these fine youngsters picked as the cream of the cream of the cream from all over the country. This would make a proper proportion, a wise admixture for the benefit of the Army itself, to wit, one-half of the officer personnel ultimately ought to come from the Military Academy and the other half from these various R. O. T. C. units, the National Guard, and the enlisted personnel of the Army, and so on. Thus the graduates of the Military Academy will feel they have some competition and that they have got to stiffen their efforts a little more, whereas the fellows who do not come from the Military Academy will realize that there is upon them an obligation to behave themselves better, to be more amenable to discipline, to study harder, to make better officers; and there will be that friendly, wise, and beneficial rivalry between these two groups which will balance them. I am very proud to say that the distinguished former Chief of Staff, General MacArthur, in his final report, after 5 years' service, stated that he thinks the 50-50 ratio is wisest and best.

Mr. BOLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWAIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOLTON. I dislike to interrupt the gentleman's discussion because it is very interesting, but I should like to inquire if a request for an appropriation for the purposes he has in mind was made by the War Department of the Director of the Budget?

Mr. McSWAIN. I will answer the gentleman's question, but I will ask him not to ask a second question. I may say that my information is the War Department estimated the expense in its tentative budget which it submitted to the Budget Bureau. That is my information, not officially, so do not ask me to say who told me because I will not say.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWAIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The gentleman will recall that last summer, when this bill was passed, it had the complete approval of the then Chief of Staff, Douglas MacArthur, and the Secretary of War, Mr. Dern, with the further suggestion, at least according to our understanding in the Military Affairs Committee, that it would be included in the proposed budget for the War Department. The gentleman will recall, furthermore, that the bill almost exactly followed the specifications given to the Military Affairs Committee by General Pershing and a former Secretary of War, Mr. Newton D. Baker.

Mr. McSWAIN. I thank the gentleman. I am going to read the language of General Pershing before the House Military Affairs Committee in 1934.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWAIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McFARLANE. I have been interested, as we all are, in the young men who want to get into the service that the gentleman is discussing. I have talked to the Department down there, and I know that the Department is friendly to the attitude that the gentleman is taking in reference to this question. They would like to see the matter taken care of.

Mr. McSWAIN. That is my belief. Of course, the Budget has reported on the matter, and the gentlemen of the War Department by Executive order cannot discuss the matter further. But that is all right. But we are the ones to decide this question. [Applause.]

Mr. McFARLANE. That is right.

Mr. McSWAIN. We do not have to ask yea or nay.

Mr. Chairman, in 1934 General Pershing followed word for word the very ideal we have sought to legislate here. He said:

I am in complete accord with the proposal for acquiring additional officers by increments. With respect to the utilization of Reserve officers during the period of acquisition, I believe that in general they should be rotated on this duty by relatively short periods, and that such use should, so far as possible, be confined to those recently graduated from our Reserve Officers' Training Corps institutions. Under these methods the invaluable training imparted would be wisely distributed and would longest effect the efficiency of the Officers' Reserve Corps. At the same time opportunity would be accorded the War Department to select from among these young men those best suited for permanent commissions.

Now, I want to remind the Members that both Houses of the Congress have approved this measure twice by unanimous consent. How? When the bill to increase the number of cadets at the Military Academy came before our committee, realizing the tremendous interests that were back of that measure, we engrafted onto the bill an amendment incorporating the provisions of the Thomason bill. It came up for consideration; and the amendment, together with the bill, were unanimously accepted. Then it went to the Senate, where it was unanimously accepted. It went to the White House for approval, and it was then referred to the Budget. From some source an objection came. The Senate and the House rescinded their action. We reconsidered the matter by unanimous consent, with the understanding that we would come forward with the other bill on its merits. We passed the academy bill minus the amendment. Then we brought up the Thomason bill, which was on the House Calendar. There was not a single dissenting voice. The distinguished gentleman from New York asked some very pertinent and proper questions, but there was not a dissenting vote. That bill went to the Senate. It provided for 2,000 officers, 200 to be commissioned annually. The Senate cut that down to 1,000 officers, 50 to be commissioned annually. Congress was about to adjourn, and rather than to take the chance of not having any legislation upon this matter that has been so dear to the hearts of those who have been seeking to accomplish a wise policy and dear to the hearts of those who are responsible in the War Department, we accepted the amendment unanimously. So it again passed both Houses.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWAIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. As I understand the quotation from General Pershing's recommendation there, it is strictly in conformity with the plan that the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee has just outlined to the committee?

Mr. McSWAIN. Yes. It seemed to me either he copied our ideas or we copied his or else we all thought the same way.

Mr. MAY. May I ask the chairman if this bill appropriates a sufficient amount of money to make possible that recommendation?

Mr. McSWAIN. It does not appropriate any money for the purpose at all. It will require about \$1,875,000 to put this into effect.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein some very interesting data from The Adjutant General's Department with reference to the great value the R. O. T. C. has been to the cause of national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, December 27, 1935.

Hon. J. J. McSWAIN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. McSWAIN: In reply to your letter of December 26, 1935, I am pleased to furnish you the following information compiled from the records of this office. It should be stated, however, that records are available only since 1920 insofar as pertain to graduates and enrollments. The enrollment figure is the total of the initial enrollment figure beginning with the fall of 1920. It should be further stated that graduates, i. e., advanced students, appear four times, i. e., twice in advanced course and twice in the basic course, taking 4 years to graduate, while basic students appear twice in number of basic students, the basic course being a 2-year course. With the above understanding your questions are answered as follows:

1. Total graduates from senior R. O. T. C. units, 76,201.

2. Total number of students enrolled in senior R. O. T. C. since 1920:

Advanced students.....	196,941
Basic students.....	1,056,281

NOTE: Based on the premises set forth above these figures may be further analyzed as follows:

Total advanced course students enrolled = $196,941 \div 2 = 98,470$.

Total basic course students enrolled = $1,056,281$ less $196,941$ advanced course students who have also been counted in basic enrollment = $859,340 \div 2 = 429,670$.

3. Expended for the R. O. T. C. since its inception, \$54,882,871.10.

4. Number of schools and colleges having senior units, 115 (opening school year 1935-36).

5. One hundred and thirty-nine junior institutions having junior units. (Records do not show number of individual schools in which units are distributed.)

6. Number now enrolled in junior R. O. T. C. units, 53,202 (opening school year 1935-36).

Very respectfully,

E. T. CONLEY,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

POLICE OFFICERS IN THE UNITED STATES—1930

The Bureau of Census, in compiling its statistics of occupation in 1930, included several categories of police officers. Included in their compilation are the following:

Policemen.....	131,687
Guards, watchmen, and doorkeepers.....	148,115
Marshals and constables.....	9,350
Detectives.....	12,865
Probation and truant officers.....	4,270
Sheriffs.....	15,338

Total.....	321,625
	130,095

451,720

In addition, under the heading "Officials and Inspectors", many of whom it might be expected to have certain police powers, the census lists the following number:

Officials and inspectors, 1930:	
City.....	48,309
County.....	30,086
State.....	15,236
Federal.....	36,464

Total.....	130,095
------------	---------

There are also 132,830 soldiers, sailors, and marines resident in continental United States at the date of the census enumeration.

R. O. T. C. are operated in the following institutions of learning:

Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Boston University, Boston, Mass.
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Norwich University, Northfield, Vt.
Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
College of the City of New York, One Hundred and Thirty-ninth Street and Convent Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Fordham University, Fordham, N. Y.
New York University, University Heights, N. Y.
Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
University of Buffalo, 24 High Street, Buffalo, N. Y.

Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.
 George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
 Howard University, Washington, D. C.
 Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Drexel Institute, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa.
 Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
 Pennsylvania Military College, Chester, Pa.
 University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va.
 Georgia School of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.
 Davidson College, Davidson, N. C.
 Presbyterian College, Clinton, S. C.
 Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C.
 Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
 Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
 Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute, Ind.
 University of Akron, Akron, Ohio.
 University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio.
 Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.
 University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Michigan College of Mining and Technology, Houghton, Mich.
 University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.
 University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
 Municipal University of Wichita, Wichita, Kans.
 University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
 University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
 University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. Dak.
 University of South Dakota, Vermillion, S. Dak.
 Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colo.
 University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.
 Baylor University, Dallas, Tex.
 Leland Stanford University, Stanford University, Calif.
 Pomona College, Claremont, Calif.
 Mississippi State College, Starkville, Miss.
 New Mexico College, State College, N. Mex.
 University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 University of New Hampshire, Durham, N. H.
 Connecticut State College, Storrs, Conn.
 University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.
 University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.
 South Dakota State School of Mines, Rapid City, S. Dak.
 University of Maryland, College Park, Md.
 Oregon State Agricultural College, Corvallis, Oreg.
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah.
 Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.
 Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
 University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
 University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.
 Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich.
 North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo, N. Dak.
 Clemson Agricultural College, Clemson College, S. C.
 Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La.
 University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
 The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.
 University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.
 West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.
 Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, College Station, Tex.
 Western Maryland College, Westminster, Md.
 University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.
 Massachusetts State College, Amherst, Mass.
 Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater, Okla.
 Rhode Island State College, Kingston, R. I.
 University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr.
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.
 University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedra, P. R.
 University of Nevada, Reno, Nev.
 Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.
 University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.
 University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii.
 University of Alabama, University, Ala.
 Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
 Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans.
 Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.
 University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.
 University of Maine, Orono, Maine.
 Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
 State College of Washington, Pullman, Wash.
 University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.
 University of Delaware, Newark, Del.
 University of Montana, Missoula, Mont.
 North Pacific College of Oregon, Portland, Oreg.
 University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg.
 University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.
 Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
 Creighton University, Omaha, Nebr.
 Quachita College, Arkadelphia, Ark.
 Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
 North Georgia College, Dahlonega, Ga.

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Powers].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention today to inflict upon the Members of the Committee a long, drawn-out discourse on the War Department appropriation bill. Several members of the subcommittee on this appropriation have already outlined various phases of the bill to you. For that reason I shall confine my remarks chiefly to a brief discussion of the appropriation for the National Guard and the civilian components of the Army.

However, as far as the military portion of the bill is concerned, I can see no reason for any surprise on the fact that it is in excess of its counterpart for the current fiscal year. Leaving out of consideration the Air Corps, which accounts for a very considerable portion of the increase, the committee was faced with a very unusual problem. During the last session many measures were passed to strengthen the national defense which, if they were not to be mere gestures, deserved the consideration of the committee. For us to appropriate in accordance strictly with the wishes of the Congress as expressed in those bills would have meant a tremendous increase. We have tried to find a happy medium, to create a compromise which would be acceptable to the Congress, and at the same time would adequately care for the national defense.

If any surprise is shown over the size of the military portion of this measure, it should be because the appropriation is relatively so small. This bill contains no money for construction at military posts, no money for complying with the terms of the Thomason bill, and only an amount sufficient for an enlisted personnel of 147,000, while we have every reason to believe the number would be 165,000. No money is appropriated in this bill, either, for establishing and developing additional air bases, as contemplated by the Wilcox bill.

Many of these things for which we were unable to appropriate should really not be deferred. However, we have reported out a bill which contains an increase of only \$23,803,501 over the current fiscal year.

This bill carries for military activities the amount of \$374,981,521. That amount is \$43,989 less than recommended in the Budget. By resort to reappropriation of \$2,845,925, the substitution of \$2,669,786 of contract authorization for appropriation, and certain reductions effected in a number of appropriations, the means were found to finance several projects not having Budget support calling for a total of \$8,447,304. There was an amount left over of \$43,989, which constitutes the margin between this measure and the Budget.

I am a strong advocate for a balanced Budget, but I hope this can be accomplished without withholding necessary funds for national-defense purposes. I also believe in a proper balance between personnel and matériel, and I feel we are a long way from being prepared in a material sense, yet I think we could rightly have been somewhat more liberal touching the Officers' Reserve Corps.

The bill provides for giving active-duty training to 21,667 out of a total of 89,404 Reserve officers eligible for training, excluding enlisted men of the Regular Army holding commissions as Reserve officers. It is my thought the number of trainees should be not less than 30,000, and that every man identified with this component should receive active-duty training not less frequently than every other year. Now, if he gets to camp once in every 5-year enrollment period, he can consider himself extremely fortunate.

The Reserve Officers' Training Corps, familiarly known as the R. O. T. C., is the main feeder to the Officers' Reserve Corps. The R. O. T. C. will have a larger enrollment next year than this by approximately 25,000, to make a total of 150,000. This increase grows out of the establishment of 26 new senior units and 41 new junior units in consequence of the larger appropriation made for the present fiscal year with such expansion in view.

The citizens' military training camps are, in my opinion, among the finest and most worthy of the civilian components of the Army. It has been provided with the same amount

of money as in last year's bill, namely, \$2,000,000. This sum will train approximately the same number of C. M. T. C. boys for a 30-day period as was trained last year—between twenty-seven and thirty thousand.

Our main civil component, the National Guard, has been very well taken care of by the committee. We have allowed them \$1,513,004 more than the Budget as the result of representations made to the committee by the National Guard Association. The amount is broken down in this way:

1. Modernization of one-half of the heavy artillery of the National Guard.....	\$888,400
2. Further additional amount for caretakers.....	56,400
3. Additional for gas and oil for armory drills.....	68,204
4. 5,000 increase in strength.....	500,000
Total.....	1,513,004

The first project embraces equipment for towing at high speed, and motor vehicles to be employed as prime movers and servicing vehicles. Such modernization will put the heavy artillery on a parity with the light artillery for expeditious, efficient, and economical movement. Movement now depends upon tractors, all of which are old and in disrepair. It has been represented that the expenditure here proposed will be repaid in 3 years in savings resulting from discontinuance of the antiquated motive power now employed.

As to the second project, while the Budget takes cognizance of the need of and makes provision for additional caretakers, the National Guard Association strongly urges an additional allowance of \$118,618. The committee has made provision for 94 additional caretakers at \$600 each, which appears to be the number necessary on account of the additional units to be established pursuant to the increase of 5,000 in strength of the Guard to occur the present fiscal year.

The project touching gas and oil is justified by the large expansion that has occurred in motor equipment.

There was a general understanding when the current appropriation act was being considered that the strength of the National Guard would be increased from approximately 190,000 to 200,000 officers and men in two annual increments of 5,000 each. The committee, therefore, is providing an amount to take care of the second increment, but, like the present year, of proportions only adequate to do so toward the close of the fiscal year. The full cost will be felt in the fiscal year 1938.

No increase is recommended by the committee in the Budget allowance for camp and armory drill pay. Attendance may or may not create demands beyond the sums included in the bill. If they do, it is not the thought of the committee that the extra load will be met by using the interchange authority and use funds provided for other objects. If an additional amount should prove to be necessary, and that can be determined better after the middle of the ensuing fiscal year, it is the idea of the committee to recommend in the appropriation bill for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1937, that an amount sufficient to meet the deficit in camp and armory drill pay be made immediately available.

I should say that the National Guard as a whole has just cause to be pleased with the recognition the committee has accorded their splendid organization. I should have liked to have provided them with some new horses. It was upon my insistence that the committee expressed itself in this way in its report on the bill touching horses for the National Guard:

It is the thought of the committee that the additional animals for which the Budget and bill make provision for the Regular Army are sufficient to take care of any pressing needs of the National Guard during the ensuing fiscal year and that the Department will see that this is done.

I believe the membership of this House will agree with me that when the present War Department appropriation bill is passed national defense will be adequately provided.

In closing, I want to pay my personal tribute to our chairman, the Honorable TILMAN PARKS, of Arkansas. Mr. PARKS, who conducted these hearings, has worked diligently since the first part of December. He has a keen insight into the various problems of national defense. He has, I believe, reported a bill satisfactory in all respects.

I also want to pay my respects to the other majority members of the subcommittee, the Honorable THOMAS BLANTON, of Texas; the Honorable THOMAS McMILLAN, of South Carolina; the Honorable BUELL SNYDER, of Pennsylvania; and the Honorable JOHN DOCKWEILER, of California.

Certainly I cannot close this short discourse without dwelling briefly upon the services of the Honorable CHESTER BOLTON, of Ohio, the ranking minority member of the committee. Mr. BOLTON's service on this committee for the past 4 years has been invaluable, with his experience as an officer

during the World War and his experience since the war as a high-ranking officer of the Ohio National Guard.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I express the hope this measure will have the support of my colleagues, particularly on this side of the aisle? After all, these large appropriation measures are difficult to frame. I believe the one we have reported is, however, a good measure. Generally speaking, I think it is a progressive measure and looks unquestionably to a state of better military preparedness. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN].

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, the press reports that the Secretary of the Navy will ask funds for dirigible construction. The Durand Committee, a subcommittee of the Science Advisory Board, has made its report to the Secretary and recommended further experiments in lighter-than-air craft. The Durand Committee is composed of very able gentlemen, scientists who visualize the future of the rigid airship. The committee was headed by Dr. William F. Durand. Other members of the committee were Prof. Alfred V. De Forest, Prof. William Hovgaard, Prof. Theodore Von Karman, Charles F. Kettering, Dr. R. A. Millikan, and Prof. Stephen Timoshenko.

EXPERIMENTING AND RESEARCH NECESSARY

It is reported that the Secretary of the Navy personally favors continued experiments with lighter-than-air craft. The Durand Committee's report is to be studied by the Navy Department before a decision will be made. Progress cannot be held back by hazards which always accompany such advances. The Durand Committee has stated, according to an International News dispatch:

Nothing—

In transportation methods—

is entirely safe. Railway travel has its accidents and casualties; surface ships are wrecked; airplanes crash; and the automobile, including errors of operation, is perhaps the most unsafe of all modern agencies of transport. Yet, in the face of these all too familiar occurrences, we do not contemplate giving up any of these means of transport.

The disasters to the *Macon* and *Akron* must not cause this country to retreat. It should not prevent us from participating or leading the way in airship development.

FUTURE OF LIGHTER-THAN-AIR CRAFT

Soon Germany will produce the latest product of years of airship study and research by a small but indefatigable band of workers. Twice as large as the *Graf Zeppelin*, in fact exceeding in size and performance any other aircraft yet built, the LZ-129 will soon be sharing the oceanic air lanes with its smaller world-famed predecessor, the *Graf Zeppelin*. The German people, through the practical medium of the *Graf Zeppelin* demonstrations, are today more "airship minded" than at any time since the World War. A new airship-operating concern has been formed around the old Zeppelin Airship Navigation Co. ("Delag") and includes the German Lufthansa and the German Government itself. Two new large airship construction hangars are now ready at Friedrichshafen. At Frankfurt another hangar and a modern airship operating base are nearly completed.

Upon the successful completion of the trials of the LZ-129 a second ship of that type will be begun immediately.

Dutch steamship interests, likewise awaiting the demonstrations of the LZ-129 are ready with money and pen in hand to close the contract for a third such ship to be employed between the homeland and outlying Dutch colonies. Just outside of Rio de Janeiro, the Brazilian Government is finishing a modern airship hangar and base. The arrivals and departures of the *Graf Zeppelin* at Pernambuco, Rio Seville, and Friedrichshafen are accepted as commonplace events and attract no more attention than similar movements of steamers. Many businessmen have learned the great advantage of 3-day passage between Europe and South America, over steamship service requiring 13 to 14 days.

DIESEL ENGINES

The commercial airship, exemplified by the LZ-129, will lead in another important aerial advance. Four diesel en-

gines of 1,200 horsepower each, operating at a fuel economy of 25 percent better than previous engines, will constitute her power plants.

COMBINED USE OF AIRPLANES WITH LIGHTER-THAN-AIR CRAFT

The Navy Department has developed the use of planes in conjunction with airships. It is a striking example of the complementary uses of the two types of aircraft as well as of correct specialization in the air.

It is entirely probable that from now on no rigid airship will ever be built without incorporated means of launching and recovering airplanes in flight. This feature seems as much a fixture and equally as important as small-boat equipment on ocean-going steamers.

THE HOOK-ON PLANE

There are many technical ways in which planes may serve airships; there are also practical remunerative ways for employing the two craft together. For example, an airship such as the *Macon* had a dynamic carrying capacity, entirely exclusive of that derived from its lighter-than-air buoyancy, of some 20 tons, or actually more than practically any heavier-than-air craft of today has for its entire lift. Of course, it is impracticable to provide a running start for a large airship to permit it to take such an additional load off the ground dynamically. The advent of the hook-on plane, however, solves the problem in a simple way. The airship first gets into the air safely and easily by its normal ballooning methods. The additional cargo up to the very limit of its full speed dynamic carrying capacity can then be readily transferred to the ship in flight.

An airship arriving under such stormy conditions as to preclude its landing at the moment, may readily and with entire safety discharge its passengers and other cargo by means of the hook-on plane while remaining aloft under full control in the air without regard to surface conditions. It may even reservice, change its crew, take on its return load of passengers and cargo without alighting. Even some of those intimately associated with airship operations felt that Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, indeed, had an unusual amount of imagination when he said large airships might remain in the air for years at a time without ever landing, and being serviced by smaller aircraft. But the successful use of planes with airships has brought his dreams very much nearer to realization.

By such cooperation of airships and airplanes and in conjunction with such splendid air transport systems as exist over our continents airship authorities say that passengers and cargo can be carried from Los Angeles to London, from California to the capitals of Europe, in less than 2 days.

NEW FIELDS TO CONQUER

The LZ-129 when completed is expected to carry 50 passengers plus 20 to 30 tons of other cargo from either Canton or Manila to San Francisco in 3½ to 4 days. The United States cannot afford to overlook a carrier unequalled in safety and comfort that can carry 50 passengers and 20 to 30 tons other pay cargo between the same points in the elapsed time of less than 4 days.

NORTH ATLANTIC AIR SERVICE

Recent conferences in Washington discussed the establishment of North Atlantic air service by a combination of several countries involved in the islands and points required by the contemplated type of carrier—the same as that now used in the Pacific—to negotiate the Atlantic. Forty-eight hours is the contemplated elapsed time of the service between the United States and Europe.

THE "GRAF ZEPPELIN"

More than 6 years ago the *Graf Zeppelin* comfortably and safely spanned the North Atlantic, nonstop, from the Statue of Liberty to the Scilly Islands off the top of England, with 63 persons, 23 of whom were passengers, and 1,800 pounds other cargo, in 38½ hours. New York to Paris was negotiated in less than 48 hours; Friedrichshafen in central Europe required only 7 hours more to reach.

Today's airship with very materially greater pay load can span this route in even less time.

SAFETY AND SPEED

It is reported that the specifications laid down by this recent conference for the proposed North Atlantic air service were: Safety, first; passengers, second; speed, third. These are specifications that the airship can fulfill. Our commercial airships have already carried nearly a quarter of a million passengers over land and sea; it began passenger service at its very inception.

NONSTOP FLIGHTS MAKE UP FOR SLOWER HOURLY TIME

The airship plugs along day and night, nonstop, with no necessity for intermediate stops on even the longest of ocean stretches. It flies on a great circle rather than in zigzag course. It actually arrives at its destination in appreciably less elapsed time than commonly believed. The airship is the bulk and quantity aerial carrier over oceans.

It appears entirely probable that it will also prove to be the most economical of oceanic air carriers. We must not forever remain oblivious and indifferent to such a carrier.

PROGRESS OF AIRSHIPS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Recent outstanding events challenge the United States not to overlook the airship in the field of oceanic air transport. In the Pacific an air-mail contract extending over a period of 10 years has been awarded. The service required is the weekly carriage of 800 pounds of mail from San Francisco to Manila and later to Canton, China, with eventual increase to about 1 ton of pay load when the carrying of 6 passengers is permitted. Each of the craft used carries a crew of nine.

The vital factor in the transportation of pay loads by air is the total elapsed time, whether the journey be broken or continuous; in this case it amounts to between 5 and 6 days. Yet on the first attempt over the Pacific the 1928 model *Graf Zeppelin*, more than 6 years ago, carried 59 persons, 20 of them passengers, and 1,000 pounds of mail and other cargo, comfortably and safely, nonstop, by day and by night, in fair weather and foul, from Tokyo to San Francisco in 69 hours, or less than 3 days!

During the last part of the journey from Germany to Japan, but a few days before, Dr. Eckener learned of a typhoon tearing northeasterly across the Sea of Japan. His concern, however, was not that of giving it wide berth; quite to the contrary, he sought out and utilized the northerly winds along its rear to nearly double the *Graf Zeppelin's* normal speed over the ground. Departing from Japan the *Graf Zeppelin* chased and overtook a typhoon to gain the advantage of the westerly winds along its southern border.

HISTORY OF AIRSHIP DEMONSTRATES ITS SUCCESS

The first regular transoceanic mail, passenger, and cargo aerial service began at the moment the first rigid airship built for such a purpose was put into service. Completed in 1928, the *Graf Zeppelin* made numerous outstanding miscellaneous flights during a few years, and then settled down to scheduled service between Europe and South America. Following the World War there were imposed on Germany, the laboratory and "proving grounds" of the rigid airship restrictions as to size of airships she might build. This hindered the development.

AFTER 8 YEARS OF SERVICE

The *Graf Zeppelin* continues to streak through the skies with full cargoes between Friedrichshafen and Rio de Janeiro.

The world little realizes the unparalleled record of commercial lighter-than-air transport for passenger and cargo safety. Already a quarter of a million passengers have been carried in unequalled aerial comfort, without so much as a scratch to a single one. By the airship the North Atlantic has been spanned with mail and passengers in 1 day and 18 hours.

On the very first attempt of an airship to cross the vast Pacific, in 1929, the *Graf Zeppelin* carried 20 passengers and 1,000 pounds of mail, flying night and day comfortably and safely from Japan, the land of the rising sun, to the Golden Gate of San Francisco in 69 hours, or 3 hours less than 3 days. And now the 5 years of scheduled operation between Europe and South America by this same splendid ship con-

stitutes strong cumulative evidence that the feasibility of oceanic transport is definitely removed from the realm of doubt.

AIRSHIPS HAVE NOT BEEN GIVEN A CHANCE

There are many reasons why airship progress has been slow. Very few people have concerned themselves with the development of airships. Only a small number of ships have been built since the World War compared with other types.

Beginning with 1919 airplane production in the United States has averaged more than 1,600 planes per year. In the whole world there have been built only 10 rigid airships of post-war design and but 156 in the entire history of the world. This and other information has been given to the world by Commander C. E. Rosendahl, of Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, N. J., a very able and distinguished commander.

Of these 10 post-war ships the *Rodensee* and the *Nordstern* were seized by the Allies and soon dismantled. The British *R-38* failed structurally during an early trial flight and burned in the air due to its hydrogen. The *R-101* flew into a low hill in France and was totally consumed by hydrogen fire. The *R-100*, a radical departure and unpromising ship, was dismantled. In the United States the *Shenandoah* failed structurally in flight and was wrecked. The *Akron* flew into the sea and sank. The *Macon*, as a result of deferred reinforcement at a structural location where it was known to be necessary, failed structurally in flight and sank in the Pacific. The *Los Angeles*, built in Germany as a reparations ship, although now more than 12 years of age, is still in good condition. The *Graf Zeppelin* is now in her eighth year of successful operation.

SCIENTISTS SEE GREAT FUTURE FOR AIRSHIPS

Recently there was held under the auspices of the Gugenheim Fund for Aeronautics, a lighter-than-air forum attended by those few scientists and other persons familiar with the airship, to discuss technical aspects. The predominating note at this forum was the unmistakable feeling of optimism on the part of those who really know what there is to be known about the airship today. The outstanding paper of the occasion was that delivered by Prof. Max Munk, a well-known American scientist, who has contributed much to American aeronautics. In this paper Dr. Munk cited some 20 features which in his opinion are worthy of serious consideration in connection with the development of airships and hold possibilities for improvement of the airship.

In citing these 20 phases which had occurred to him, Dr. Munk did not mean to indicate that the present-day airship has that many important faults. Practicable airships can be built and operated today. The present status of heavier-than-air craft is due to continued evolution and refinement and to the contributions from such scientific bodies as the National Advisory Board for Aeronautics.

Certainly such agencies can contribute equivalent progress to lighter-than-air craft if they are given the occasion for such work.

New engines, materials, principles, and developments in heavier-than-air may be expected to have an influence on lighter-than-air improvement. Speed, strength, reliability, general utility will increase in proportion to the efforts exerted on such problems.

SPECIALIZATION NEEDED

America should take the lead in airship development. Experts should be encouraged to assist in research activity.

The principle of specialization holds good in aerial transportation just as in every other form of transport. There is no doubt as to the practicability and utility of lighter-than-air craft. There are advantages of the airship entirely sufficient to warrant continuation of its development. Congress should realize the advantages of the airship and provide a program of research to determine the advantages of the airship for commercial and military purposes.

It is a sad commentary that there has not been on the statute books of this Nation legislation establishing the lighter-than-air ship as a common carrier. The legal basis of the airship should be established.

Just as the merchant marine and the advances in general ship construction influence the development and improvement of naval surface vessels, so would an aerial merchant marine exert its influence on the development of the air service.

There is room and need for both heavier-than-air craft, carrying light loads for short or moderate distances at very high speed, and lighter-than-air craft, carrying much greater loads for much greater distances and much more comfortably and safely, at speeds not so high as the airplane's, but much greater than those of which surface vessels are capable. In a Navy such as our own there are jobs to be done which can best utilize the long-range airship scout and the smaller nonrigid airship for anti-mine and anti-submarine operations, convoying, and such duties as require an elevated platform and wide speed variation from zero up to much more than the speed of which surface vessels are capable.

These days attempts are being made to give heavier-than-air craft ocean-going characteristics while carrying worthwhile loads. Serious consideration has been given to such ideas as building and anchoring, all the way across the ocean, a series of huge artificial islands as airplane landing fields, since nature's own are too far apart.

At the same time there is a growing tendency to blink at the practicability of further improvements in airships; and in some cases we even find a comparison of day-after-tomorrow's heavier-than-air craft with day-before-yesterday's airships.

In the United States no rigid airships were built until after the World War and then only three. Summarizing:

Rigid airships

I. Built and flown before the World War:	
(a) Germany.....	29
II. Wartime design, built and flown:	
(a) Germany.....	104
(b) England.....	14
Total.....	118
III. Post-war design, built and flown:	
(a) Germany.....	4
(b) England.....	2
(c) United States.....	3
Total.....	9
IV. Totals:	
(a) Germany.....	137
(b) England.....	16
(c) United States.....	3
Grand total built and flown in entire world.....	156

And yet because we have not achieved our rigid airship goal by building three naval airships, there are those who clamor for a cessation of the whole program. One wonders what sort of Navy we should have today had we been forced to decide the adequacy and finality of the battleship, the cruiser, the destroyer, the submarine, the airplane, when only three of each type had been built.

Our latest battleship is the forty-eighth designed; we are approaching our two hundredth submarine and our four hundredth destroyer.

So, judging by the vastly greater sums of money spent and the many more units of other types built and the fact that the succeeding units in each class will represent still further progress rather than mere reproduction, one cannot but feel it would be unwise and unfair to draw final conclusions as to the naval rigid airship when we have built only three of them, and as to the commercial ship when we have built none.

COST OF AIRSHIPS

There is an impression that the airship is costly.

The *Shenandoah*, built by the Navy, cost \$2,200,000. The *Akron* and *Macon*, first airships built by private concerns in this country, cost \$5,358,000 and \$2,600,000, respectively. Built in numbers, airship costs would recede materially.

The figures as to the cost of our airship program throw light on the seriousness of our effort. Since 1918, the Navy has spent on its lighter-than-air program about \$40,000,000,

which I am informed includes \$2,000,000 paid on the British R-38 (ZR-2), never delivered to us. Uncle Sam still has two splendid airship bases: Lakehurst, representing a plant inventory of some \$9,000,000; and Sunnyvale, more than \$5,000,000.

In addition, we still have equipment and assets of various kinds, not including good will, if any, and experience, of at least another million dollars' value.

Actually, \$25,000,000 represents the Navy's major lighter-than-air expense over a period of some 17 years. Using a familiar old reduction to simple terms, this represents an outlay of only about the price of one stick of chewing gum per year per person in the United States.

On the basis of the full \$40,000,000, the average annual outlay has been \$2,352,941; on the "deductible" \$25,000,000 basis it has been \$1,471,176. The total lighter-than-air cost for 17 years would hardly have built one battleship; it certainly did not prevent building of any surface vessels or airplanes for it was "earmarked" for airships and not for general expenditures.

GENEROUS GOVERNMENT AID TO RAILROADS

It is entirely apparent from a study of all the facts that with the assistance of generous land grants the transcontinental railroads came into being.

A recent feature article on our merchant marine mentions that the sum by which our Government came to the assistance of the merchant marine, in the fiscal year 1934, was \$26,700,000.

This 1 year's assistance to the merchant marine is practically equal to 17 years' expenditure on lighter-than-air ships by the Navy, the Government agency in whose hands the development of the airship rests.

AID TO AIR MAIL

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there recently appeared figures relating to the United States air-mail costs. For the 4 fiscal years of 1931-34 the revenue from domestic air mail was slightly more than \$24,000,000, the "expenditure" was nearly eighty millions, giving an "excess of apportioned expenditures over revenues" of nearly \$56,000,000, which is an average contribution of almost \$14,000,000 annually to domestic air mail.

Turning to foreign air mail, the revenue for the 4 years was slightly more than \$4,000,000; the "expenditures" were nearly seven times as much, or more than \$28,000,000. Foreign air-mail support, therefore, cost out of Uncle Sam's pocket more than \$24,000,000, or an average of more than six millions a year.

Altogether foreign and domestic air-mail support has required in 4 years about \$80,000,000, an annual average of nearly \$20,000,000.

This average air-mail support for only 1 year is equivalent to nearly 14 years' total expenditure on naval lighter-than-air. After all, the rigid airship also has demonstrated that it can carry mail and passengers safely over both the North and South Atlantic and the Pacific, and does so regularly between Europe and South America. Judged by comparable expenditures on American air mail, the total sum expended by the United States on rigid airships would indeed seem very small had it been spent solely on their development as commercial carriers, whereas actually naval and other governmental uses also are being developed from them.

Everyone knows the criticism that results when any airship has trouble. But no such call for extermination goes out when a steamer or an airplane gets into difficulty; instead, the cry is to join hands in solving their problems. After generations of shipbuilding, the latest ocean mammoth suffers so severely from vibration troubles that even the most sympathetic propagandist cannot avoid comment; it even necessitates structural changes and new propellers. Only a few years ago new cruisers developed sternpost troubles.

But in neither case was there a cry to exterminate the giant liner nor the cruiser; their troubles were accepted as necessary grief in advancing the art. Yet if an airship is lost as a result of deferred structural reinforcements there is a clamor for no more airships.

Certainly airships at the bottom of the seas are no good to anyone. But why and how they got there must be considered. Surface vessels up on the rocks, submarines fast on the bottom, flying boats splintered into matchwood—none of these, either, is any good to anyone.

Analysis of the major airship losses since the World War shows that in these 17 years there is at least a well-founded suspicion that the failure of the human equation, human fallibility somewhere along the line from design to operation, was to an appreciable degree responsible for the loss. This statement implicating the human equation is based almost entirely on the official findings and reports in each case.

ACCIDENTS

Turning now to loss of life, everyone is familiar with the mournful cartoons that adorn the printed page and the list of famous accidents brought to light whenever an airship has difficulties.

If swayed by some of these representations, one might think the airship the greatest offender of all modes of transportation. Actually it is the least.

VALUE OF LIGHTER-THAN-AIR CRAFT NOT APPRECIATED

Of all pioneering development transportation the airship is probably the least understood. Unfortunately it has been judged largely by "hearsay" evidence. Many groups which have investigated the airship fully enough have found much in its favor. A great deal of information was uncovered by the House Naval Affairs Committee, which investigated the replacement of the *Shenandoah*, and the joint congressional committee, which investigated the loss of the *Akron*, but this information about the value of lighter-than-air craft was kept in the background since there was greater "human-interest appeal" to other phases of the investigation.

RECORD OF SAFETY FOR AIRSHIPS

Following the World War, the small *Bodensee*, in brief operation before the Allies seized the ship, carried many passengers in entire safety. The Goodyear fleet of blimps has carried nearly 180,000 passengers with a perfect safety record. The *Graf Zeppelin*, the first airship built for and operated on oceanic routes, for more than 7 years has carried thousands of passengers as well as cargo, in perfect safety. That ship has made more than 50 round trips between Europe and South America and more than 500 flights. And what about the crew casualties? Actually, there has never been a casualty to a single member of any commercial rigid airship crew. In the commercial blimps, one pilot and two members of a ground crew comprise the total casualties. Organized commercial airships have carried nearly a quarter of a million passengers with complete safety to them and with only three crew casualties. This is the information and these are the figures of Commander C. E. Rosendahl, of Lakehurst Naval Air Station. I am greatly indebted to Commander Rosendahl.

NEWSPAPERS PLAY UP SENSATIONAL AIRSHIP ACCIDENTS

When we turn to the so-called miscellaneous airship operations, we find that the casualty record of airships falls almost entirely to Army and Navy operation.

In the entire world in major airship accidents since the World War there have been lost 282 lives. Life is just as precious whether it is lost en masse or less spectacularly, but airship losses, for various reasons, are particularly sensational it seems. In other forms of pioneering accident figures utterly dwarf these airship losses.

SUBMARINE ACCIDENTS

Although the origin of the submarine is said to date back some 300 years, and in the United States certainly to Civil War days, there have been reported in the navies of the world 69 major accidents involving 80 submarines and the loss of 771 men since the World War. Yet construction and operation of submarines goes forward unchallenged the world over.

The development of water-borne vessels has been continuous from the dugout canoe and Noah's Ark up to the modern floating fortresses and seagoing palaces of today, literally through centuries. Yet, since the World War, "notable"

marine disasters have accounted for more than 100 ships and the loss of 12,000 lives. The seagoing public is not much disturbed; however; last year's oceanic travel was among the heaviest.

Since the World War railroad casualties in the United States alone have totaled nearly 100,000 killed and well over a million and a half injured. Yet fear of casualties certainly has not outlawed railroads or prevented widespread rail travel as part of our daily lives.

Turning to man's most indispensable servant, the automobile, we find that even during the 1 week end of Labor Day, 1935, in the United States alone deaths due to automobiles amounted to nearly 300, or more than all those for which airships have been responsible in 17 years. Last year 36,000 lives were charged up to automobiles in the United States—one life every 15 minutes, one person injured every 31 seconds by automobiles. Yet the average citizen evinces little, if any, indignation or alarm over this situation. Instead, many only dig deeper into the pocketbook, sign another note, or skimp elsewhere to acquire any sort of an automobile to enter in the casualty competition.

Under the heading of "Home casualties", statisticians have recently informed us that from such common matters as "falls, fires, poisoning, wrong pills, and so forth, and on the farm from machinery improperly handled, mistreated livestock, especially bulls", and so on, there were 34,500 lives lost in the United States alone in the 1 year of 1934.

Summarizing then, we find the following startling situation so widely divergent from popular opinion. In the same period—since the World War—compared with airships, submarines have taken a toll of nearly 3 times as many lives; marine disasters have taken more than 40 times as much life; railroads killed more than 300 times as many persons; automobiles have accounted for more than 1,000 times as many deaths.

NAVAL RIGID AIRSHIP USES

American naval rigid airships have demonstrated the complete feasibility of carrying their own planes to sea and utilizing them very efficiently for detailed scouting purposes. Airships of the future certainly will carry more than the five planes borne by the *Macon*. They will be able to maintain continuous airplane scouting from the airship itself. By such means the airship should never allow itself to come within either gun range or enemy airplane range. The details of the discovery and reconnaissance of areas or enemy forces are left to small high-flying planes sending back their information by radio telephone to airship which with its more powerful equipment passes it on to the commander in chief.

Against attack from a small number of enemy planes the airship has the advantage of a larger machine-gun battery, located to protect all possible angles of approach, with the advantage of a more steady gun platform.

In the subcloud observation car, the airship has another distinctively advantageous asset. Cruising entirely hidden and unseen in the clouds above, the airship can lower an observer in a basket, by means of a cable, 3,000 feet long. With his navigation instruments and telephone connection with the ship, the observer in the basket may, if desirable, even carry on the navigation of the airship above in addition to having the observational advantages of his elevated platform in the open sky over the sea. Often there are various levels of haze over an ocean which impede vision from mast tops or from aircraft. The observer in the subcloud car is able to select the level which gives him the best visibility under the existing conditions. The future may hold other devices of equal effectiveness for incorporation in a scouting airship.

LUNDEEN DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR SERVICE BILL

On February 28, 1919, 17 years ago, I introduced a bill—H. R. 16195, Sixty-fifth Congress, third session—to create a Department of the Air Service.

On June 29, 1935, I reintroduced the bill as H. R. 8729, containing the same principles and with practically no changes in wording. Gen. William Mitchell, two-fisted fighting champion of the Air Service, examined both of these bills

and, I am glad to say, approved both H. R. 16195, Sixty-fifth Congress, third session, and H. R. 8729, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session.

LIGHTER-THAN-AIR CRAFT POLICY

By an agreement of long standing between the Army and the Navy, the Navy has agreed to assume the responsibility for the development of the rigid airship in this country. The naval policy pertaining to lighter-than-air craft reads:

To build and operate rigid airships as necessary, to determine their usefulness for naval and other governmental purposes and their commercial value.

To build and operate such nonrigid airships as are necessary for training purposes and to determine their value for naval use.

UNIFIED AIR SERVICE WOULD STIMULATE RESEARCH IN AIRSHIPS

The results of this naval policy are still to be achieved. The very limited amount of experimentation so far in no way justifies the cessation of the airship development at this time. The recent report of the Durand Committee suggests what can be done with research in this field. The committee's recommendation for more experimentation in the field should be carried out. This development of airships is important from commercial, naval, and military standpoints. I urge Congress to act on the Durand Committee's report. We need further experimentation in lighter-than-air craft, and in the future I hope to see a unified department of the Air Service which will do justice to research and experimentation possibilities in all fields of air navigation.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, an adequate system of national defense is a question of major importance to this Nation; and when it ceases to be one, we will cease to be a nation. Our armed forces are just as essential to our national safety as are our fire, police, and health departments to our personal welfare. In fact, our armed forces are our only guaranties of national safety. If we do not maintain them at a proper state of efficiency, we are false to our fathers, false to ourselves, and false to our posterity.

Who are the most earnest advocates of preparedness? Those who know from first-hand experience all of the death, suffering, hardships, and horrors of war. These men need no college sophomore or professional sob sisters to tell them of the horrors of war. They bear pictures on their minds of the horrors of war which they will carry to their graves; pictures of a fair land laid waste by a ruthless invading army; homes, farms, and factories destroyed; a population under the iron heel of their conquerors; thousands of brave men slaughtered because of inefficient leadership. The men who have seen these sights in a foreign land are determined that they never shall come to their own land. They hope and pray that the day may never come when it will be necessary for their own sons to go forth to battle. But if this day ever does come, they wish to see them go forth properly equipped, capably led, trained in body and mind, fit in every manner for the hardest game on earth. These men are willing to look the facts of history in the face and admit that the history of the world is but a series of invasions and supplantings of peoples. They do not wish their own race to become one of the supplanted. [Applause.]

Unfortunately, we have among us many who would tear down our system of national defense. Many of these people are inspired by the purest of motives. They fanatically persuade themselves that it is very easy to end all war by the simple expedient of saying to the world at large: "Do not come this way to fight. If you do, you will be disappointed. We will refuse to fight." It would seem that they must predicate their attitude upon the belief that wars are waged merely for the purpose of combat. They choose to ignore the fact that war is but a means to an end.

Certainly universal peace would be a most desirable condition and welcome to the entire world. There is no denying that fact, and such a condition should be the goal of the entire world. Hasten the millennium; but who can guarantee it coming or its continuance? Can the college sophomore, in his infinite wisdom and with his comatose communistic brain,

solve the age-old problems of the world? After he has been graduated from college and begins to devote his time and efforts to the study of mankind he will then realize his lack of knowledge. Can those who base their hopes upon the power of treaty or mandate or the efficacy of prayer guarantee that these agencies will preserve their nation's integrity? We may believe in their sincerity, if not in their sound judgment, when they are willing to trust the safety of their lives, health, or property to the same agencies to which they profess to be willing to trust the safety of their nation. Their intentions may be of the very best and their motives of the very highest. Let them remember, however, that a nation rendered helpless by the purest of motives is even more helpless than if rendered so by the basest of treachery.

History, being a record of past events, contains some very valuable lessons. Time has stripped the occurrences of the past of their theoretical and sentimental aspects; and under the pitiless light of practicability their truisms stand out as shining beacons for the guidance of present and future generations. Let us examine the record and see what has been the fate of those who trusted to intangible agencies for protection.

Let us take southwestern Pennsylvania, for instance. This section was exposed to 40 years of the most merciless Indian warfare ever known. Many Quakers came to this region to found homes. They were firm believers in a policy of non-resistance and descended for protection upon prayer and treaty. Their scalps were dried in the wigwags of the Shawnees and Wyandots. Today none of their descendants inhabit that populous and prosperous region. Also many Scotch-Irish came to this region to settle. When the Indian warwhoop resounded they barred the door, took the flintlock rifle from above the mantelpiece, and poured cold lead into the ranks of the scalp hunters. Many of these Scotch-Irish were killed, but the most of them survived, and today their descendants possess the land.

It might also be mentioned in passing that while the Indians were willing fighters, they were unorganized, exceedingly careless in the care of ordnance, depended upon an unorganized commissary for rations, and placed undue faith in the matter of treaties. The best-known monument to the Indian is The End of the Trail.

There was a time in the history of the world when the inhabitants of northern Africa had a fanatical belief that a ship which flew the flag of a Christian nation was a gift from Allah. Their chief means of livelihood was capturing these ships and appropriating their cargoes. They also enslaved those among the passengers and crew who survived the capture to hew their wood, draw their water, and till their fields. Prayers, treaties, threats, and bribes were resorted to for protection to no avail. Then the United States Navy wrote a new chapter into the Koran which stated that ships which flew the Stars and Stripes were, by virtue of the marksmanship of Yankee sailors, under the special protection of Allah. Thus the Mediterranean Sea was made safe for American commerce, from which resulted thriving industry and great fortunes. Let us hope that none of those who have since benefited by this, what might be termed dollar diplomacy, are among those who would demand peace at any price.

Many of us can remember with what anxiety we watched the newspapers for news of the advance of the allied expeditionary force into China during the Boxer Rebellion. Many American citizens were in those cities, besieged by the blood-thirsty hordes of Boxers. Some were there upon diplomatic missions, some upon commercial missions, and some, so I am told, were upon missions which denounced appeals to arms. I have been told that the rescuers were welcomed alike by all classes. Not even the most ardent nonresistant among them objected to being saved by armed forces.

Such lessons are not beyond the memory of the youngest of us. Switzerland was an oasis of peace and security during the World War. Her farms, her homes, and her industries were secure behind her splendid army, in which every able-bodied male citizen is a soldier. Manchuria writhes in agony beneath the ruthless advance of the Japanese Juggernaut. Impotent, unorganized, unarmed, helpless, and hopeless, she

must submit supinely to the imperialistic exploitation of a nation seeking raw materials with which to supplant, if possible, the Caucasian race. What benefit has she derived, or what benefit did Korea derive, from treaties, mandates, prayers, protests, or policies of nonresistance? Is not the price of peace at any price too dear, when it amounts to the loss of national integrity? What normal man can live and unblushingly state that he prefers the loss of his nation's autonomy to fighting a war to maintain it?

Let us look again at the facts of history to learn the causes of war; not in any attempt to justify war, but merely to ascertain the truth regarding its causes. War, as I have stated, is but a means to an end. Some few have been fought with religious domination as an objective; some have been fought to secure or maintain the liberty of a people. The vast majority, however, have been fought for commercial reasons, commercial contests carried to the nth degree. From the time of savagery wars have been fought for the control of hunting grounds, pasturage, raw materials, markets, or for the control of the natural-trade lanes connected with commerce. Wherever trade lanes converge or commercial interests conflict there are the seeds of warfare. If we are to remain a commercial nation, we must be prepared to protect our commerce. It may all be very well to shout, "dollar diplomacy", "protection of vested interests", or "the rich man's war, but the poor man's fight", but the fact remains that commerce is the commerce of the Nation. The interruption of commerce may easily result in internal consequences, more serious than foreign warfare.

International commerce has been called the lifeblood of civilization. It is the factor which lifted mankind from the state of savagery. Family traded with family, tribe traded with tribe, state traded with state, and nation traded with nation, in the endeavor to procure those commodities which they needed most. We live by commerce and we cannot eliminate it from our modern life. The determination to progress cannot be wiped out of the human race. Without commerce we would retrograde. Nation has supplanted nation throughout the ages in obedience to the urge for progress, and they will continue to do so. Human nature is the most unchangeable factor since Genesis. The ready will supplant the unready, and the fit will inhabit the most desirable portions of the earth. I prefer for my posterity a desirable portion, even if I must resort to arms to retain it.

A very dangerous opinion regarding national defense is growing in this country. Many have the idea that our armed forces should never leave our shores or waters to fight. They believe that our attempts at defense should be entirely passive. No plan of national defense could be more dangerous. History records no instance where any major conflict was won by a passive defense.

Mr. BIERMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. If the gentleman can give me an instance, I will yield, but not for a speech.

Mr. BIERMANN. Where was the World War won?

Mr. FADDIS. On German territory.

Mr. BIERMANN. It was won in France.

Mr. FADDIS. It was won on German territory; the war was not over until the invasion of German territory was threatened.

Mr. BIERMANN. That is news to me.

Mr. FADDIS. It was won in France, but it was on German territory because Germany had taken it. It was fought on what was termed "German territory." Was the gentleman there?

Mr. BIERMANN. I was.

Mr. FADDIS. So was I.

Wars have always been won in the territory of the enemy, and can be won in no other manner. The best defense is always a vigorous offense. The hostile will to combat must be crushed. The advantage of the initiative is more marked now than ever before. Modern armament, the advent of flying craft, and rapid transportation have not revolutionized the principles of warfare. They are the same as they were in the days of Alexander the Great. What these agencies have accomplished, however, is to render any plan of passive

defense more ridiculous than ever before in history. Furthermore, if we must ever fight, let us have the destruction in the land of the enemy, not in our land.

We are no longer protected by the oceans to the east and west. They have been bridged by mechanical progress. We have a vast territory to protect, and it is absolutely impossible to patrol our borders, even to the extent of giving notice of approach of an enemy. To defend our territory, we must meet the invading forces as far as possible from our frontiers. We must, by the threat of retaliatory invasion, make them wish to remain at home. Even if we were to adopt such a policy as passive defense, the results of it would soon bring about a reversal of public opinion, which would demand the offensive. By this time our condition would be hopeless. We would be too weak to reach the vital centers of the enemy. Suppose, for instance, that we were able to protect ourselves from a sustained attempt at invasion or from serious damage by a system of passive defense. What would be the internal consequences? History again furnishes many examples of a people confined by blockades or sieges. The inevitable breakdown of industry, due to the impossibility of procuring essential commodities, would bring about internal collapse and force a disastrous peace.

We have among us another class of self-styled pacifists whose motives are not what they profess them to be. They are ones who have no sympathy with our form of government and wish to see it overthrown. They clamor for disarmament in order to weaken us from within. They might best be likened to rats gnawing holes in the walls of a granary. They are prostituting, in many places, our institutions of public instruction in order to spread their un-American doctrines. Although prompted and often financed by a system of government which admits of no freedom of speech or action, they oppose any measure to regulate their insidious activities with appeals for constitutional liberty. One of these days the patience of the descendants of those who founded and maintained this Nation will become exhausted. They will arise in the might of their wrath and behead these serpents in the manner of their fathers, which manner was severe but effective.

Those who advocate a weakness which invites imposition should consider well what may be the ultimate consequences of their fanatical disregard of the natural laws of the world and the lessons of history. They are jeopardizing the safety of their Nation. If they could guarantee the success of their objective, they would be justified. If they could cite a successful precedent, their ideas would be entitled to consideration. This they cannot do and do not attempt to do. The day may come when the blood of slaughtered thousands of men, sent raw into battle as they were picked raw from the streets, will be upon the heads of these pseudo students of mankind. The value of maintaining the integrity of a people cannot be measured in dollars, property, or lives. Upon such occasions the courage, self-sacrifice, and heroism of a proud people will know no bounds. If ever the day comes when by our impotency we are a conquered Nation, these ardent advocates of national helplessness can flee to some barren desert which the enemy does not desire and raise their voices in that joyful song, "I did not raise my boy to be a soldier."

This Nation was founded, maintained, and preserved by the force of arms. We sincerely hope that for us, and indeed for all the world, the war drum may sound no more. We are not a militaristic nation and are in no danger of becoming so. We have no imperialistic ambitions. We must, however, be prepared and determined to preserve, at whatever cost, that which our fathers established at so much sacrifice. To this end let us, in the words of General Putnam, "Trust in God and keep our powder dry." [Applause.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Young].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, the present Neutrality Act expires on February 29, 1936. This prohibits the exportation of munitions of war and provides that Americans who travel on the vessels of belligerent powers do so at their own

risk. We now give consideration to permanent neutrality legislation. We propose that our Nation remain a good neighbor to all the nations of the World. By legislation we propose to establish, as the policy of our Government, the propositions that in event of a war between two or more foreign nations we will not permit loans of American money nor extension of American credit to any nation engaging in war, and that the export of arms and munitions of war are prohibited as soon as actual hostilities commence. Furthermore, American citizens must not joy ride on vessels of nations involved in war.

Let us fervently hope that there will never again be a World War. Let us legislate so that if that catastrophe comes the American people, profiting by the lessons of bitter experience, will stay out.

The Father of our Country in his Farewell Address warned Americans against entangling alliances with foreign nations. Let us remain unentangled and free. There is no more important duty before this Congress than to enact proper legislation to take the profit out of war and to make it less likely that this Nation will engage in war by the enactment of this necessary legislation providing for actual neutrality in fact as well as name.

Manufacturers and dealers who are so greedy for profits that they would sell war materials to a foreign nation actually engaged in war should not receive much consideration from us as representatives of all the people. This sort of trading is the very thing which might drag us into a European war. Small profits for today for manufacturers and dealers may mean terrific cost for the American people for tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, profiteering in war by the sale of munitions and arms is the vilest business practice known to mankind.

The McSwain bill, H. R. 5529, now pending in the Senate, aims to prevent profiteering in time of war and to equalize the burdens of war. By enacting this bill into law we promote the cause of peace and at the same time provide for national defense in event of war.

The American Legion, of which I am a member, has for more than 15 years advocated that, in event of war, wealth and industry should be conscripted the same as men. The American Legion, out of the experience of the World War, has decreed as one of its great fundamental policies there should be a "universal draft." Young men—the flower of our American manhood—left homes and loved ones in response to a grave national duty. They offered their lives as sacrifices for their country. They were paid \$30 per month. Mechanics and shipbuilders, 3,000 miles from the dangers of war, who furnished the munitions of war and the ships to convey the munitions received \$200 and more per month. Industrialists, who came up like mushrooms, made thousands of dollars per month under contracts to furnish munitions and supplies. This must never occur again.

It is indefensible to compel one man to endure the hardships of war, to offer his life as a sacrifice, while another is earning profits from war.

It is proper and I am happy to support seizure by our Government of 100 percent of all excess profits. During the war period our Government should seize the entire income of every industry in excess of the average amount of annual income for the period of a year or so preceding that war. Let us legislate to make war unprofitable and we shall make peace profitable. Let us make all bear the burden of war. If our country is compelled to enter any conflict, both industry and man power should be mobilized. When we do this we make it more probable that our country will remain at peace with all the nations of the world.

In every war waged heretofore by our country profiteers and vermin of that ilk have thrived. Gen. George Washington complained of the profiteers of that period. He wrote, "No punishment is too great for the man who can build his greatness upon his country's ruin." I personally know families whose fortunes were created by war contractors. We all know the scandals of the Spanish War and the staggering cost of treasure and human life because

we tolerated human vultures who sold "embalmed beef" for our soldiers' use. We know too well of the many fortunes made almost overnight during the World War. This bill provides that the Executive may fix prices as of a date before the declaration of war. After this bill becomes a law there can be no inflation, no profiteering—the prices must remain at the level fixed or below that level. Speculation on the threat of war would be fruitless.

The McSwain bill, as amended, is important to every man, woman, and child in America. Ex-service men generally will hail its enactment as a step in the right direction—toward making it less probable that our country will engage in war.

Nations frequently war for purposes of national aggrandizement. Greed breeds war—the desire for more territory, plunder, loot. This bill was strengthened by amendments in the course of the debate in the House of Representatives. It is evident that the majority here in the Congress earnestly desire to take the profit out of war, and in event of war to conscript wealth, industry, and men. There are some here who oppose conscription. Let me say we might as well manfully face the facts. If and when war comes there will be conscription of our manpower, and there should be conscription. Let us look ahead and legislate now deliberately and intelligently. We should not wait until possible war hysteria assails our people. Let us plan ahead to conscript industry and the managers of industry, wealth, and the holders of capital. There will then be less likelihood of our ever again entering any war.

We should provide that no person drafted into the armed forces of our country in time of war may be compelled to serve upon foreign soil, except to prevent or repel actual invasion of the United States. We should also provide that soldiers drafted into the armed forces for the defense of our country must receive wages equal to the average daily wage of unskilled labor. During the World War there was no real objection among thoughtful people to the selective-service draft. Soldiers did not object to conscription. They did object, and the mothers of this land object with equal force, to civilians profiteering while soldiers serve in the trenches at a dollar a day.

My conclusion after careful study of this bill, as amended, is to support it and hope earnestly for its enactment. We thereby lay a solid foundation for peace. We make peace more profitable and make war unprofitable to all.

There are many white crosses in France and Belgium, imbedded in soil, forever American, because of the sacrifice of the lives of American boys who left their homes and loved ones and fought in "a war to end all wars." Let it not be said that the graves of our American dead are forgotten. Let it not be said that those supreme sacrifices were in vain. On the contrary, let us be guided by the lamp of experience. Let us take the profit out of war and keep out of war. [Applause.]

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I do not have a river or harbor in my district back in Michigan and, so far as I know, there is no navigable water in my district which comes under the jurisdiction of the laws of the United States; but, as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of this House, the bill now before the House has attracted and challenged my interest and attention. It has done so because the bill appropriates money to put into effect the projects which the Rivers and Harbors Committee considered and approved in the bill that was passed by the Congress last year. In the river and harbor bill which was passed in the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress there were many projects listed, especially in the Great Lakes region. That bill was 5 years in the making. It was the first river and harbor bill before the Congress of the United States since 1930. So far as I know, every project in that bill, at least within the last 3 years, had the most careful consideration of that committee before it was passed on and included in the river and harbor bill. I find on examining that bill there were 48 projects in the Great

Lakes region. I refer now to H. R. 6732, the river and harbor bill of last year. The 48 projects in the Great Lakes region were divided among the States in that region in the following proportion: Minnesota had 3, Wisconsin 11, Michigan 17, Indiana 3, Ohio 8, Pennsylvania 1, and New York 5. The present bill now before the House for consideration, the Army appropriation bill, has in it nearly \$39,000,000 for maintenance of river and harbor work throughout the United States and our island possessions. It also has in it \$100,000,000 for new river and harbor work. I was much surprised and disappointed to find that out of the 48 projects listed in the Great Lakes region but 6 are included to be constructed under the present appropriation bill.

Mr. BOLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. BOLTON. As I understand it, the list submitted by the Chief of Engineers to the committee, which covers approximately \$100,000,000 in projects, was largely a tentative list, which is elastic and may be changed if, in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers, there are other projects which are more important in the interest of commerce and navigation than those listed. I think we ought to have that in mind in considering that list. The practice prior to our public works and relief and recovery programs, followed by the Chief of Engineers this year, I find in looking back upon previous appropriation bills, has been the same as in 1934 and all years previous to that.

Mr. DONDERO. I conferred with the Army engineers last Saturday on that very point and was informed that for more than a score of years it has been the policy of this Government not to earmark any money in a bill of this nature, in order that it might be shifted, adjusted, or changed as the exigencies of the time suggest.

Mr. BOLTON. That is exactly the point I desire to bring out. This money is not earmarked in the bill for these specific projects.

Mr. DONDERO. But I want to call attention to the fact that if the projects which are in the tentative list are carried out, the entire Great Lakes region gets less than \$1,200,000, or a little more than 1 percent of the \$100,000,000. To my mind that is entirely out of balance. It is disproportionate when we consider the importance of the Great Lakes region. On the breast of the Great Lakes moves practically 25 percent of the entire tonnage of the United States. Last year the entire tonnage of this country was approximately 414,000,000 tons. Ninety-one million tons of that moved on the waters of the Great Lakes. It is a natural highway, which taps the granary of the Nation over which we bring food to the pantry and kitchen of a vast proportion of the people of our country. In my judgment, it is not for the general welfare or the best interests of the Nation that a region as important as the Great Lakes should be neglected or denied a reasonable proportion of the money necessary to improve its harbors and rivers, in order to keep them adequate for commerce, transportation of foodstuffs and raw materials by water, which is the cheapest transportation that we have in this Nation today.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. PETTENGILL. I wish to congratulate the gentleman upon the splendid statement he is making in behalf of the Great Lakes projects. Whether the little drib that is left in the bill is earmarked or not, it is very plain to the gentleman and all of the other Members of the Congress representing districts on the Great Lakes, that they will not get the work done that was authorized in the act of last August. That is plain, is it not?

Mr. DONDERO. At least it indicates that the wind is blowing in that direction?

Mr. PETTENGILL. Well, there is not enough money to go around.

Mr. DONDERO. There is not. It is not very comforting, especially for those of us who come from the Great Lakes region of the country, to know that in the bill are two projects, which, if carried out, will take \$45,000,000 from this

bill. It is not very comforting for us to know that where we have about \$8,000,000 worth of work that could be done and is needed in that particular region of the country, \$7,000,000 of it is denied; but one member of the administration can get \$364,000,000 turned over to him by Executive order to indulge in a resettlement or a great real-estate scheme by which something new is to be promoted in this country and put the Government in the real-estate business. I refer to Tugwell, who says that America must be made over. I say it is not very comforting, and I wonder if it is justified to deny the Great Lakes region the little money that is needed and give so much for a project that is wholly new, and, I think, foreign to the American principles of government.

Mr. BOLTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. BOLTON. I simply want to add to my remarks that I am heartily in favor of what the gentleman has said, but as a member of the committee recommending this bill it is not my impression or thought that this money for rivers and harbors is in any way earmarked for the projects enumerated in the hearings.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman is correct about that, but it does indicate that if the engineers carry out even in a partial degree the present program, that the Great Lakes region will not have received a reasonable or adequate amount of money to do the new work that should be done in that part of the country.

Mr. BOLTON. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MAPES. I desire to supplement or add my endorsement to what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PETTENGILL] has said in regard to the good work which my colleague, as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, is doing in looking after the interest of the Great Lakes. And I should also like to refer to what the gentleman from Ohio has said with reference to this question. Is it not fair to assume, after the Board of Engineers has submitted its recommendations to the Committee on Appropriations, outlining where this \$100,000,000 is going to be spent and not having included the projects on the Great Lakes, that it is going to be very difficult, after the preliminary study by the Board of Engineers, which it must have made, and after this definite recommendation or suggestion as to where the money is to be spent, for those interested in any particular project around the Great Lakes, to get the Board of Engineers to change its position or to persuade the Board that its initial recommendations were wrong?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] has stated a correct analysis of the situation and has arrived at a proper conclusion, that it will be difficult to change the set-up as it now is in this bill and in the report, from the present figures, after it has once been passed and the appropriation made.

Mr. MAPES. In other words, there is no need of anyone's fooling himself.

Mr. DONDERO. That is exactly so; but I have the hope that the engineers, before it is too late, will see the justice of this suggestion at least and that a reconsideration will be made by them and more money will be spent on new projects in the Great Lakes section. I do not speak entirely for my own State; I speak for the entire Great Lakes region.

I want to compliment the subcommittee on its good judgment in striking from the list \$29,000,000 on five projects which were never authorized by law. I notice that on page 25 of the report the committee has this to say, and I think it ought to be brought to the attention of the House and of the country, because it is of sufficient importance:

The committee is in thorough accord with what seems to be the future policy completely to finance such projects out of specific regular annual appropriation, but only after such projects have been authorized by law.

The committee had in mind the five unauthorized projects on which nearly \$15,000,000 of the taxpayers' money has

already been expended, and which will require something like \$218,000,000 more to complete. The committee was justified in saying that they desired to have such projects receive the consideration not only of the Corps of Engineers but the legislative committees of Congress having jurisdiction of such matters, and of the legislative bodies themselves. I say the committee is to be complimented for bringing in a report containing a statement of this kind. Had Congress pursued this policy in the last 3 years, the \$15,000,000 would not have been expended on projects which will take \$218,000,000 more to complete. The worst two of the five, in my opinion, are the Florida Ship Canal, estimated to cost \$143,000,000, and the Passamaquoddy project in the State of Maine, which will cost \$38,000,000.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PETTENGILL. What light can the gentleman from Michigan, as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, throw upon the question of what hope there is of getting money at this session to complete the projects that were authorized by Congress upon the unanimous recommendation of the Board of Engineers in the act passed last August?

Mr. DONDERO. There is no hope of getting any of that money unless it comes from money turned over to the President by this Congress. In my opinion, no money should have been asked of Congress, particularly for the five unauthorized projects. Had the administration not gone ahead and allotted money on these projects without waiting for them to be authorized by law—had that not been done, and had further moneys been appropriated, there would be no need for such a statement in this report.

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MAIN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that money is now being expended for the Florida Ship Canal project?

Mr. DONDERO. Five million two hundred thousand dollars was allocated to the Florida Ship Canal out of the \$4,880,000,000 given the President by Congress last year.

Mr. MAIN. Does the gentleman believe there is anything Congress can do to change the situation?

Mr. DONDERO. I doubt it. I think the \$5,000,000 has already been expended, or most of it, and the work begun. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. As to the necessity for the work in Michigan and in the Great Lakes section, I have been receiving letters. Here is a letter dated February 3, 1936, from the Great Lakes Harbor Association, stating:

I am attaching hereto a list totaling close to \$7,000,000 for projects that ought to be under way as soon as spring begins. These projects are of immediate need; they are not futurities; they ought not to be delayed except for the single and sole reason of governmental fund limitation. But, if funds are to be spent anywhere, these projects are of prime importance; not because they are in the Great Lakes Basin, but because they are essential to an already existing navigation tonnage.

I have here also a letter from E. R. Luedtke, mayor of the city of Frankfort, Mich., from which I read the following:

Colonel Tyler, division engineer, United States engineers office at Cleveland, has requested \$7,500,000 for the Great Lakes. Any amount less than that must deprive some of our harbors of improvements which are urgently needed. The city of Frankfort has a very vital interest in this appropriation. We have, for a number of years, sought relief from the gradual shoaling of our harbor. The seriousness of the situation will be apparent with the information that a considerable amount of dock property in Frankfort has already been lost for boat operations because of the lack of water. At one time these docks served as terminals for large boats. At the present time they can be reached only with difficulty by light-draft fishing tugs. After a few more years they will be lost for even that purpose.

At the present time all shipping in and out of Frankfort is restricted to a very small area. In spite of the limitations, the value of the annual cargo which passes through Frankfort is the second largest of any port in Michigan. When a port of our importance is permitted to become less useful because of a lack of funds to maintain its usefulness, then it would appear that

extreme efforts should be made to prevent any further reduction of funds to be expended on the Great Lakes.

I have other letters of similar import.

Mr. FIESLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FIESINGER. The gentleman is making a very fine statement, with which I am in entire accord. The burden of the complaint of people with whom I have been in correspondence recently is that the Great Lakes are getting such a small amount of money.

Mr. DONDERO. I think this protest is justified, and I hope the engineers will correct it before it is too late.

Mr. FIESINGER. It is absolutely justified, and I hope it will be corrected by the Board of Engineers.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I want to endorse everything that was said by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. McSWAIN]. Not only do I endorse what he said about the splendid work of the subcommittee dealing with military appropriations, but I feel a very special interest in the matter of adequate provision for the Reserve officers as provided in the bill that passed at the last session of Congress. I sometimes wonder if the Members fully appreciate the hard work and patriotic service of the great chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs. He is one of the finest and ablest men in this body, honored and respected by all the members of our committee.

For a long time he has worked hard in an effort to see to it that justice is done the Reserve officers. I am sure there is not a member of the Military Affairs Committee, likewise any Member of the House, who is not wholeheartedly and enthusiastically for West Point. On the other hand, we feel friendly to the R. O. T. C. organizations throughout the country, which are turning out so many fine young men. Particularly do we feel friendly to the fine military schools and colleges that dot the United States. I have none in my immediate section, although the A. and M. College of Texas, together with several others, are doing a great work. Out near the city of El Paso, but over the line in the State of New Mexico, at the beautiful little city of Roswell, is the New Mexico Military Institute, which turns out a great many fine young men who go there from all over the country. Many States of the Union are now represented at this school.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to know something about the type and character of young men who come from that school. I say without hesitation, that excepting only West Point, there is no greater military school in the Nation. I am also proud of the fine work being done at V. M. I., Culver, The Citadel, and all the other military schools. Time does not permit a mention of all of them. But these fine young officers coming from these schools are entitled to a chance. I do not assume to speak for the committee, but I believe I voice the unanimous sentiment of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs when I at least express the hope that this committee when it comes to the reading of this bill will provide for a reasonable and adequate sum so that these thousand Reserve officers may have a year of training, and thereafter the War Department give 50 of the best of them permanent commissions in the Army.

In view of the fact that by unanimous vote the House expressed itself on this question, and likewise the other body, we ought to put this law into effect at once, especially when it has the approval of the War Department. I hope the friends of these young officers will assist us if such an amendment is offered.

Mr. Chairman, I only have a few moments at my disposal, and there are one or two other things I want to mention. There has been some criticism on this floor today about what Major General Hagood, corps area commander of the Eighth Corps Area, had to say before the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations. It may be, Mr. Chairman, he was not as happy in his choice of language as he might have been.

Few Army officers are politically minded. They are usually very frank. General Hagood is a great officer with a great record. Whether you agree with the language he employed or not, I believe it is the sentiment of the Members of this House that he spoke the absolute truth in regard to permanent construction under the relief program. Instead of all this money being spent for raking up leaves and a lot of other stuff of that kind we had better erect some permanent buildings, which are absolutely necessary, and everybody knows it. This is true not only in the case of the Army but in other lines of Government work. He well expressed it when he said he wanted to build permanent buildings for the Army so that his grandchildren would be glad to show them to our grandchildren in the days to come. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. PARKS. The gentleman, of course, knows that where the distinguished major general is now stationed they have the most beautiful, and I may say the most extravagant, housing in the United States, including a \$150,000 jail.

Mr. THOMASON. That is all true, but Major General Hagood is not responsible for that. I am the friend and admirer of General Hagood, and I am not going to let him be misrepresented here.

Mr. Chairman, last fall a year ago when the Secretary of War, together with others from the War Department, visited the city of San Antonio, the people of San Antonio, including my good friend Mr. MAVERICK, were kind enough to invite me to join them. General Hagood took the Secretary of War and those on his staff, together with the Congressman from that district and myself, for a visit to Fort Sam Houston, and it was he who pointed out that jail to which the gentleman from Arkansas just referred and stated how ridiculous it was to put that much money in a jail when the Army had not asked for it, or, at least, he had not. He made it very plain he did not approve of its size, cost, or architecture.

I want to be perfectly frank. I have a big Army post in my district, Fort Bliss, of which I am very proud. I think it ought to be, and I think it will come to be, the great Cavalry post of the Nation, known and recognized as such the world over, because climate, environment, and location are all conducive to it. It is strategically located on the Mexican border and has the enthusiastic support of all the people in El Paso, as well as throughout the Southwest. While I am very proud of the new improvements which have been made at my post within the last 2 years, may I say there were some barracks built there which were too fine? They should not have been so expensive, and we could have had more of them. That is one of the things I am coming to in connection with the statement for which General Hagood was criticized. I do not care whether you get appropriations from Congress to do it or allotments from W. P. A., but I think we ought to get something out of that \$4,800,000,000 fund. Some of that money ought to be earmarked for permanent Army housing. However, there is nothing in this bill for it, and the W. P. A. thus far has turned us down. This same corps area commander in the hearings, referring to the post in the district I have the honor to represent—and I point them out, of course, largely because of personal interest—stated that \$3,428,965 could be wisely spent at Fort Bliss, near El Paso, Tex., and that \$1,085,700 could be wisely spent at the William Beaumont General Hospital in El Paso, and likewise down at Fort D. A. Russell at Marfa, Tex., the sum of \$322,716 could be wisely spent. The War Department recommends these sums. In connection with this last item I should like to bring you the glad news that although I appeared on this floor a good many times during the last 3 years, getting to be almost a nuisance when I fussed so about the way the War Department moved the troops from Fort D. A. Russell, I am very happy to report to you now that they are all back, and then some. The War Department assures me they are back to stay this time. All I ask you to do is to give us some money for decent housing and permanent improvements. These small posts are doing a fine work over the country. They

are deserving of our wholehearted support. I know of no small post anywhere so well suited for military training as Fort Russell. It is my judgment, however, that Cavalry should be sent back there, as I hope and believe it will be. It is located 200 miles from El Paso and 400 miles from San Antonio, and is in what is known as the Big Bend country of Texas. It has been the finest and most stabilizing influence for maintaining international good will with our fine neighbors to the south of anything that has happened in my country for many years.

Mr. BOLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOLTON. The gentleman has been discussing the housing program of the Army. Is it not fair to say in connection with the gentleman's remarks that the recommendations of the War Department with reference to Army housing were not carried forward by the P. W. A., but the buildings were constructed as Mr. Ickes and his assistants thought proper and without regard to the recommendations of the War Department?

Mr. THOMASON. That is all very true and that is the reason men like General Hagood should not be criticized because they built a million-dollar jail at Fort Sam Houston when he did not want that kind or one so expensive. The same is true with respect to some barracks at Fort Bliss. We would rather have had some smaller barracks, more homes for the officers, and some stables for the horses.

In connection with the situation at Fort D. A. Russell, I should like to quote from the hearings of this subcommittee:

Mr. PARKS. General, I should like to ask you about two posts and get your opinion about them. Fort D. A. Russell at Marfa was abandoned as a cavalry post?

General HAGOOD. Yes.

Mr. PARKS. Then it was reinstated as an infantry post, I believe?

General HAGOOD. Field artillery.

Mr. PARKS. Now, what is the condition at Marfa, and what, in your opinion, would be the expense to build it up and to put it back in the state it once was? I do not mean as a cavalry post, but to make it valuable to us. I understand the numbers there are very small now. What are our needs at Marfa, if anything?

General HAGOOD. Well, when we were directed to rehabilitate Marfa, I sent staff officers down there, who made an estimate of \$250,000 to fix the place up. I sent a telegram to the War Department and told them if they would give me \$50,000 I would make a good job of it, because I did not think we would get the \$250,000. So we took the \$50,000 and put it in fair shape. It is working, but they have had to rent a number of buildings in the town, even the quartermaster storehouse. And in my statement above there is an estimate for \$322,000 to completely rebuild Marfa; but, as I stated elsewhere, these estimates are based on using what I call "stage money", with all kinds of cheap labor. And I think if they had in the neighborhood of a couple hundred thousand dollars and could use it in any judicious way they could put that place in wonderful shape.

Mr. PARKS. Do you think its importance justifies that expenditure and the maintenance?

General HAGOOD. Yes; because this regiment that was created out of the 50,000 men you added to the Army we have to put somewhere. We are putting these men in double-deck bunks in some of the old barracks at some posts. But even at that we cannot get room for them.

But I must hurry on. I just wanted to mention this to indicate that, in my judgment, General Hagood was right about this matter of permanent construction at Army posts. It has to be done sooner or later, so why not buy the material now and put men to work and have something to show for the money for the next 25 or 30 years? It would require a lot of material and put a lot of unemployed men to work.

There is another thing I want to mention briefly, and that is to say a word for the poor old horse. Some say the dog is man's best friend, but I think the honor should be shared with the horse. I remember that 4 or 5 years ago it almost amounted to treason to get up here and say anything about the horse, because there were a few of our friends here at that time who wanted to do away with the horse in the Army. They were willing to mechanize and motorize the whole United States Army; and I have the idea that if we had some of the high officials of the Italian Army here now they would tell you, as every great army general of every nation in the world tells you, that the horse is absolutely indispensable. They even talked about mechanizing and motorizing all the

Army down there in my country. Why, you get in the Big Bend country of Texas—and no one knows it quite so well as my distinguished colleague who represents a district on the Texas border, Mr. KLEBERG—and you get a half a mile off the highway in that country and a motor cannot go 100 yards. That is a wild country. I refer to the topography, for the people are the best and finest in the world.

I am very happy to see in this bill a substantial appropriation for horses.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is the gentleman aware of the fact—and it is a fact, I can assure him—that there were more horses employed per 1,000 men in the Allied Armies than there were in the Union and Confederate Armies in our War between the States?

Mr. THOMASON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, because I have heard men on this floor in the last 3 or 4 years get up and say that the horse is just about an extinct animal so far as war is concerned. The horse is probably the most essential thing in the Army next to men and munitions. The gentleman from New York knows what an Army should be, and he is also a lover of good horses.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. KLEBERG. Another interesting phase of the matter has to do with the training necessary to make soldier and the horse a service unit. Anybody can drive a traction unit, because you can learn to do that in a few minutes, but the handling and care of a horse is an entirely different proposition.

This should be apparent inasmuch as a high percentage of the men of military age know how to drive an automobile. The automobile and the tractor are actuated by the same motive power, the internal-combustion engine, and therefore have the same system generally of major controls.

The riding of a horse is essentially different, and particularly today, when so few know how to ride. There is every reason, backed by history in both defensive and offensive warfare, to substantiate the continued maintenance of a substantial branch of the Army cavalry and again with particular reference to those posts along the Mexican border.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman is quite correct.

Here is what General Pershing said about the horse:

There is not in the world today an officer of distinction, recognized as an authority on military matters in a broad way, who does not declare with emphasis that cavalry is as important today as it ever was.

Marshal Foch said this:

On the western front cavalry especially participated in the defensive battles where they were engaged at the most difficult moments; here the large cavalry units, thanks to their own mobility, were able to intervene in time and to bring the precious assistance of their fire to the weak points of the defense.

General Summerall had this to say:

There has been a great deal of misinformation broadcast relative to the cavalry. It is a fact that cavalry is of far more importance than it ever has been.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Has the gentleman anything from General Allenby?

Mr. THOMASON. My friend the gentleman from New York asks if I can quote from General Allenby. I can well imagine how he feels about the matter. He would probably like to get hold of some of our fine Texas horses, as well as some from our remount stations. You can understand why I am so proud of Fort Bliss. I want you to help me get adequate buildings and more horses so that will be the one great Cavalry post of which the entire Nation will be proud.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by giving you the figures I have obtained in the last few days from the War Department relative to the animal situation in the Army, and likewise I want to give you some figures relative to our remounts, because a great many of you people represent farming sections. This program means much to the farmers and ranchers. I wish I had the time to tell you

about the fine horses being raised around Midland and other towns in west Texas. The people are interested and will cooperate to the limit.

The War Department tables of distribution of horses and mules for the Regular Army in the past 7 years have been reduced from a total of 34,000 animals in the fiscal year 1929 to 24,973 in the fiscal year 1937, a net reduction of 9,027 animals. This reduction has been made possible by the motorization and mechanization of various units in the Army during this period.

The present War Department tables of distribution call for 24,973 animals, and provides only enough horses and mules to carry on the peacetime training of the mounted units of the Army that have not been motorized or mechanized. This strength, however, is actually short about 3,000 animals that would be necessary to supply these units if ordered into field service with all the required items of combat equipment.

The actual appropriations that have been made by Congress for the past 4 or 5 years have not even kept the mounted units of the Army up to this reduced training allowance of horses and mules. Today instead of having on hand a table of distribution strength of 24,973 animals, the Quartermaster General's reports show that only about 21,115 animals were on hand September 30, 1935. This, therefore, makes a shortage of 3,858 animals in the training allowance and a shortage of 6,858 animals which would be necessary for our horsed units to operate under field conditions.

The normal losses in animals in the Army is 10 percent a year. At this rate there would be a loss of 17½ percent in the 21,115 animals now on hand, between September 30, 1935, and June 30, 1937—that is, 3,695 animals by the end of the fiscal year 1937, for which the present Congress is now making appropriations.

There are about 1,400 horses to be purchased during the fiscal year 1936. Deducting this supply from the loss of 3,695, leaves a net loss of 2,295 between September 30, 1935, and June 30, 1937. When we add this loss to the present shortage of 3,858 animals, it amounts to a shortage of over 6,000 animals in the War Department Tables of Distribution. This appropriation bill for the Army in the fiscal year 1937 proposes to provide only 3,762 animals to cover this total shortage of over 6,000 in training needs of mounted units.

Many people throughout the country and Members of the Congress believe that motors should entirely replace animals in the Army; yet no nation in the world today has adopted complete motorization and mechanization for its army. During the Manchurian campaign Japan purchased large shipments of horses in this country. Italy has also recently purchased a number of horses and mules in the United States. Military authorities the world over are retaining horse units to operate over certain types of terrain where such units are still more effective and more mobile than motorized and mechanized units. The United States has much terrain of this character.

Many foreign countries, so I am told, due to a shortage of horses and mules, are forced to mechanize and motorize regardless of whether mounted units are more effective. The United States is most fortunate in having an abundant supply of horses and mules, having on hand, according to the Bureau of Animal Industry reports, 16,622,000 compared to a total of about 12,800,000 in all of Europe, including Russia.

Your attention is invited to the fact that this appropriation bill includes approximately \$75,000 for Army horse breeding operations. With this meager amount, 648 well-bred stallions are placed throughout the United States for the use of farmers and breeders, and fully 12,000 colts are produced each year. The average value of these colts is conservatively estimated at \$150 each, which gives a total production of \$1,800,000 a year. This appropriation has gradually been reduced over the past 4 or 5 years from \$150,000; it should be restored to the original figure. The farmer who breeds these colts is allowed to sell the best of them in the open market at any price he can get, which is usually greater than the Government will pay. The Army, in its purchases of horses, gives preference to the colts sired

by these Government stallions and the purchase of the 3,762 animals called for in this bill not only keeps up the efficiency of the mounted units of the Army but also is a direct aid to many farmers throughout the country—and we all know how necessary this aid is at this time.

We should not let the Army fall behind this way in the efficiency of the few mounted units that are still important to retain. These units should be brought up to their training allowance of 24,973 animals in the next year or so and thereafter the yearly losses of about 2,500 animals should be promptly provided for. By this procedure we keep both an efficient Army and a steady market for our farmers who are producing horses.

The distribution by States of remount stallions is as follows:

Location of stallions by States, Jan. 1, 1936

Alabama.....	1
Arizona.....	15
Arkansas.....	3
California.....	32
Colorado.....	31
Connecticut.....	1
Florida.....	2
Georgia.....	2
Idaho.....	21
Illinois.....	1
Indiana.....	2
Iowa.....	2
Kansas.....	16
Kentucky.....	2
Louisiana.....	8
Maine.....	2
Maryland.....	7
Michigan.....	1
Minnesota.....	4
Mississippi.....	8
Missouri.....	6
Montana.....	42
Nebraska.....	29
Nevada.....	18
New Mexico.....	40
New York.....	4
North Carolina.....	4
North Dakota.....	6
Ohio.....	3
Oklahoma.....	44
Oregon.....	19
Pennsylvania.....	5
Puerto Rico.....	1
South Carolina.....	1
South Dakota.....	25
Tennessee.....	2
Territory of Hawaii.....	5
Texas.....	125
Utah.....	34
Vermont.....	1
Virginia.....	20
Washington.....	9
West Virginia.....	2
Wyoming.....	42
Total.....	648

The following remarks of the Chief of Cavalry at the Army War College in 1934 are pertinent:

It was demonstrated at extended maneuvers at the Cavalry School in 1934 with mechanized cavalry and horsed cavalry that:

Mechanized units are more sensitive to the incidents of terrain than are any other units. Any stream large enough to appear on a 1-inch map forms an obstacle which, if defended, varies from serious to prohibitive.

Demolitions assume an unprecedented importance, and their skillful use by the enemy in open warfare will reduce greatly the chances for a mechanized unit to carry out successfully a mission which requires movement over a great distance.

At night mechanized units by themselves are very vulnerable if an enterprising enemy is near.

The fuel supply of a mechanized unit during an extended operation will have to be most carefully planned, executed, and protected throughout.

Great speeds on road reconnaissance may result in break-downs and accidents, as well as affording an enemy the opportunity for ambushing the vehicles.

A mechanized unit is a very effective force for daylight, delaying action on suitable terrain.

It can seize and hold by day critical points, but cannot develop its great offensive power for an active defense at night; hence, when it secures an important objective, it should be supported promptly by other troops moving rapidly across country and perhaps under fire. Normally horsed cavalry will furnish this support.

The combat car is a shock weapon. The inherent limitations for machines for proper battle reconnaissance of strange terrain

were brought out very forcibly during the maneuvers. The essence of successful attack is the combination of effective fire and threatening movement. But this movement must develop into an actual assault over ground suitable for such a movement. To launch an attack of mechanized vehicles over unknown terrain will be extremely hazardous.

The scout cars of the horsed regiments and the armored cars of the mechanized regiment extend greatly the zone of action of general reconnaissance of cavalry by day, linking up the air reconnaissance with that of horsed patrols. When it comes to the specific reconnaissance of a locality where detailed information not obtainable from vehicles or their immediate vicinity is required, resort must be had to men on horse or on foot. For counter-reconnaissance the mechanized vehicles should be effective against vehicular reconnaissance, but should not be able to stop horsed patrols.

Successful antimechanization measures for any force should be based upon securing timely information; taking advantage promptly of terrain, especially stream lines; having and making efficient use of antitank weapons.

With the better horses furnished in recent years and the improved horsemanship in the cavalry, horsed cavalry is able to cover long distances either in daylight or darkness much more rapidly than heretofore. It was clearly demonstrated, however, that horsed cavalry could not have operated successfully without the three recent developments now incorporated in its organization.

Without its scout cars to inform it generally of enemy movements it could have moved but blindly, and could not have extended its demolition activities to any useful distance. Without its antitank weapons it could not have dared to make contact with any mechanized unit. Without its motor transport for supply the extent of its movements would probably have been about one-half of what they actually were.

All these added to our present great fire power in rifles and automatic weapons give our horsed units much greater mobility and power of destruction than ever before.

The supply of some of the new means has been touched upon already; in addition the War Department procurement program provides for replacing the 75-mm howitzer and for the mechanization of a second cavalry regiment. The possibility that other elements may be organized and supporting troops developed and attached to the mechanized regiments is envisaged in present War Department policy.

The proper proportion of horsed and mechanized cavalry can only be determined through experiment after the means are furnished. When the present procurement program is completed it may be found desirable to reorganize the Cavalry Corps now provided in War Department mobilization plan, possibly along the lines of the one employed in the recent C. P. X.

In conclusion, this combination of horses and mechanized cavalry, as we see it developing, provides a very powerful, highly mobile element in the Army combat team.

Attention is also invited to the testimony of General MacArthur during the hearings on the War Department appropriation bill, fiscal year 1936, page 28, in which he stated:

Motorization and, to some extent, mechanization permit the rapid concentration of troops on the critical terrain; that is, the battlefield. But after you reach the battlefield the fastest element is the man on a horse. So what you have to do is to hit a balance, so that you will have enough automotive power to swing large commands under cover of darkness 100 or even 200 miles in a night and get them there, but after you do get them there, generally speaking, the fastest maneuvering element that you have is still the man on horseback * * *

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KENNEY].

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to cut down these appropriations for the Army, but these appropriations cannot be voted down, for they are war appropriations providing for a greater and stronger and necessary national defense.

Ever since my early youth I have been an advocate of a safe and sane national defense. Going back in retrospect to the days before the World War, I can remember a memorable occasion at Williams College, where in attendance were high dignitaries of the Government, among them William Howard Taft, Secretary of War, later to become President; Secretary of the Interior Garfield, a son of James Garfield, who was a President of the United States; Secretary of State Elihu Root, the intellectual giant of his day; and the then President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt.

Patriotism was a necessary quality of good citizenship then as it is now and ever will be; what is more, patriotic duty

was inculcated in the youth in the schools of the Nation and more fervently in the homes at our mothers' knees.

Addressing the assemblage, President Theodore Roosevelt's theme was Patriotism. From the platform, making no attempt at oratory, with his characteristic American fervor, he dwelt upon the duties of citizenship and all that they entail, including the duty of maintaining a strong national defense.

Pounding his right fist in his left palm, he vigorously uttered words that have never stopped ringing in my ears:

We must have peace, but if we must have war to have peace, then we will have war that we may have peace.

Amplifying, he impressed upon his listeners, of whom I was one, the necessity of being prepared for war, because, first, we could not have peace if we were not strong enough to cope with war, and, second, we could not make war if we were too weak to keep our peace.

That was Theodore Roosevelt's doctrine then. It is Franklin Roosevelt's doctrine now. It is good American doctrine. But in those days, as now, in some quarters there was a tendency to put off the strengthening of our defense until the morrow; war was for the future; so should be the adequate national defense.

Almost a decade later I viewed with interest upon the screen in a theater in the city of New York a moving picture portraying a war of the future. Regiments of soldiers marched from the large cities into the villages and beyond to the fields. Combat scenes were enacted frightful in carnage, depicting all the horror of war. Above airplanes vied with each other, birdmen pummeling away with machine guns and now and again dropping a bomb. For me it reechoed the words of Theodore Roosevelt, but at the close of the performance one could hear, as the audience wended up the aisles to the exits, such comment as "It was thrilling, but so unreal"; "It lacked realism; there will be no war." And, yet, there was war. Less than 9 months later the World War broke out in Europe. We thought war was remote for us, even as we looked in the press each day to follow the changing course of the Hindenburg line, much as we now watch the weather map in the lobby for weather conditions during the severe winter blasts and storms that are sweeping the Nation.

One morning we read of the sinking of the *Lusitania*. That was an overt act of war against us, whatever else might have been brewing by way of secret treaties, international jealousies, financial entanglements.

So what! The United States was at war—at war—unprepared for war.

"Men, men, our kingdoms for your men!" That virtually was the cry of the Allies, the nations we were joining to wage war. "Hurry up, America!" That was the plea. America would hurry, but she had to prepare. Oh, had America been prepared, would the *Lusitania* have been sunk? Was it not safe for any Nation to believe that America, short of a miracle, could not effectively play a major part in the war for a year, 2 years, or longer?

The United States of America did hurry—hurry to get the men—the men so vitally necessary for success—the success that was brought to the war by the men of the United States of America.

In the emergency the selective-service law was passed and became operative. Under it local registration boards were set up together with district boards, State headquarters, and national headquarters.

One by one the flower of the youth of the Nation was registered and in time the names were at the Capitol in Washington.

What was done in Washington? The Government of the United States engaged in a gigantic lottery of human lives, "the greatest lottery that history ever knew."

Do not attribute these last words to me. They are the words of Major General Crowder, provost marshal general, former Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

In his book entitled "The Spirit of Selective Service", published by the Century Co. of New York, he writes of the need of men and the raising of them by lottery.

At page 150 of his book General Crowder writes that you may read:

On swept the German hordes, pausing only for renewed and greater efforts. Paris was under fire, the channel ports were threatened, and the whole Allied cause hung for a fateful moment in a trembling balance. Frantic calls came to America from the western front. Men must be had and had at once. America must furnish them, and in numbers far beyond the wildest dream of a year before.

Oh, yes; men had to be had, men, men, not money, money by lottery, but men, men, and by lottery.

Continuing, writes General Crowder:

Food was vital, munitions and supplies were indispensable, but all must give way to the imperative call for men. For it was men alone that would stem the tide and save the world from the German onslaught.

When men were scarce and hard to get and insufficient to carry on the war, the Allies turned to America. America met the crisis, miraculously, by resort to the lottery—the lottery of human lives—the “greatest lottery that history ever knew.”

Harken not to me, but glance into General Crowder's book, where, speaking of the drawing of men for the American Expeditionary Forces, he writes, at pages 130, 131, as follows:

What an event in American history that episode which began at noon in the public hearing room of the Senate Office Building on Friday, July 20! From the moment the Secretary of War drew from the bowl the first fateful figure until the last of the 10,500 capsules had been extracted, the Nation paused in the busy bustle of war-time preparation to await with bated breath the close of the greatest lottery that history ever knew.

Continuing, the general emphasizes the efficacy of that lottery when he writes:

For as each number left the bowl it sent its call to more than forty-five hundred young men scattered throughout America, fixing upon each his place in the great army of volunteers that had responded 6 weeks before. Into every home the fateful message went. The banker took a moment from his all-alluring task; the merchant paused an instant in his busy mart; the farmer rested on the handles of his plow; the laborer left his daily work unfinished; and the idle youth saw in life a new and keener interest. All eyes turned to fix their gaze upon the crowded room where 10,000,000 destinies hung suspended. The Nation glimpsed a common interest, sensed a common understanding in a thing that lifted to a single level class and race and creed and color and social status and fused the spirit of a people in a single aspiration and the hope of a common success.

A single aspiration and hope of common success is attributed to our people through a lottery of human lives. Oh, if ever again our aspirations and hopes of success are based on a lottery, may that lottery be for aspirations and hopes of economic success through voluntary contributions of our people rather than a lottery of human lives for war consumption and military success.

Our lesson learned must be remembered. First and foremost, we must build a strong national defense to keep us out of war. A neutrality law setting forth the aims and purposes of our strength and defensive power will serve to proclaim our purposes to the world without possibility of misunderstanding, incongruity, or misconception. But any new neutrality law must do that very thing. It must proclaim not a shifting doctrine but a firm, adamant doctrine like the Monroe Doctrine. That is American doctrine. Any new neutrality law must be typically American doctrine.

Whatever doctrine is proclaimed through a law of neutrality, it must be fair to ourselves and fair to all nations. There is now pending in the Congress a proposed new neutrality law that ought not to pass, and in good conscience should not pass. Our best interests and the best interests of the world will be served more efficaciously if we but extend the present Neutrality Act passed at the last session of the Congress.

We must be careful not to pass a law that will plunge us into war. The new proposed law might do that unwittingly. Any law should fix a definite policy that would apprise all nations of our determined, settled stand. The Congress should not delegate but must reserve for itself the power to declare this country's policy, which should be set out in

the law itself. If that cannot be done, better that we have no neutrality law.

We must be careful not to commit an act of war in attempting to avoid war. At the moment two countries are at war—Italy and Ethiopia. If we undertake to impose sanctions or embargoes after the commencing of hostilities by these peoples, we are, in my view, if we extend these sanctions and embargoes to food and the necessities of life, verging close to or actually committing an unfriendly act approaching an act of war.

There are two objectives only—immediate objectives—in waging war. The one is to starve the people; the other is to kill them.

If the League of Nations should impose sanctions on Italy—sanctions that would starve the Italian people—the imposition of the sanctions would undoubtedly be tantamount to a declaration of war. We do not wish to declare war upon Italy or pass any law or take any step that would lead to war with Italy. The United States must be fair to all nations. The nationals of all countries have contributed to her upbuilding, her greatness, and her strength. The Italian-Americans and Americans of Italian extraction in this country, millions in number, have deep-seated affection for Italy, but that affection does not lessen but rather accentuates the love and devotion they have for this liberty-loving land of ours. The Ethiopian people, too, in our midst have a keen feeling for the country of their birth or extraction, but the spirit of America is ingrained in all peoples who have come to live in and be adopted by the United States of America. We must be fair, just, and impartial to all.

Why do we hear of sanctions—sanctions now being considered by the League of Nations? If Italy is to be attacked, it will be by sanctions. Any neighbor nation will hesitate to attack her in any other way. Why? Because the major attack would be by airplane. Italy is especially vulnerable to air attacks. Many of her large cities are near her frontier and coastal points. The objective of any present-day military attack would be to destroy them. If such an attack should be made, it would not only cause untold havoc and destruction but it would set an example for all nations gone mad in the future to start an end to civilization.

Since war seems inevitable and may at any time threaten our security, we ought to make our defense worthy of us. In doing so, we must devote especial attention to our air bases, particularly at our vulnerable spots which are for the most part our coastal points. We must not neglect our Army and Navy, but we should lay special emphasis upon the importance of bases for airplanes for attack and defense at strategic places. For instance, down on the Pacific side of the Panama Canal we have at the present time fortifications which assure security from any naval penetration of the Canal. There is no fleet of any country in the world which can go through there. If destruction should come in time of war it would be by airplane.

In the near future we shall have provided air bases over the country. We want the best that honest judgment and experience can furnish. In making the selection I venture to suggest that we could not do better than select as a base for the northeast Atlantic coast the airport available at Teeterboro, in Bergen County, N. J., in my congressional district. It has obvious advantages. It is but a stone's throw from the George Washington Bridge which connects New York City to the mainland. In the garden of New York, it is close by the site of Camp Merritt, chosen by the Government as the principal gateway to the battlefields of France during the World War. West Point is also nearby. No other airport is more ideally located. Its unusual facilities have been recognized by the greatest aviators, who have repeatedly used the expansive meadowland for trying out new planes. Amelia Earhart took off from Teeterboro Airport to make her successful flight across the Atlantic. Bert Balchen and other noted flyers used it constantly. Charles Lindbergh, of my district, and of whom we are all so proud, has frequented the port and will, I am confident,

regard its selection as commending itself to the approval of the country.

Anthony Fokker built his great Fokker planes there. It is rich in history and advantages. The land should be preserved for the Northeastern coastal base here. But it is within the metropolitan district of New York and may not long be available. I urge its immediate selection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include in my extension of remarks a statement by the Chief of Cavalry.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, this is the Army appropriation bill. I want to apologize for taking this time to talk about something different, but before going into my subject I do want to concur in everything that has been said pertaining to the appropriation regarding rivers and harbors, especially as it affects the Great Lakes. I live in a district—in fact, I represent one of the greatest shipping ports on the Great Lakes. The twin cities of Duluth and Superior combined have more tonnage going in and out than the great port of New York. That may be news to some of the Members but, nevertheless, it is a fact. I know. I hear from the people back home, and they are very much disappointed in the amount that is contemplated to be spent in the Great Lakes region.

I know that in the very near future we are to consider the agricultural bill. I perhaps will not get an opportunity to say anything during general debate on that bill, so I want to take this opportunity to say a few words in behalf of the greatest industry within agriculture, namely, the dairy industry. This industry comprises at least 25 percent of the total agricultural income.

A permanent program, of course, will not be considered at this time. Whatever program we may consider in the near future will, of course, be a temporary program; but I hope that eventually we can see our way clear to build a permanent program for agriculture, and especially for the dairy industry.

As a temporary program I would recommend including in this bill a revolving fund to stabilize the markets, a fund such as we had once before. I hope such a fund will be included in the bill and that it will be continued for some time to come. The next thing, and most important, of course, is to stop the ever-increasing importations of dairy products; and we know that it is increasing. During the last 4 or 5 years it has increased, in the case of butter—to take one item—from 1,000,000 pounds to 23,000,000 pounds per year. It has reached such proportions that it has a direct effect on the price the farmers receive for butter. Another difficulty the dairymen face is competition from so-called butter substitutes. It is not fair that he should be forced to compete with them, and I am sure every fair-minded person will admit it is unfair. Then, if production of crops is to be controlled, the dairy farmer must be protected by prohibiting supposedly idle acres being used for the production of crops that will be turned into production of milk or the equivalent of milk. This, of course, has happened in every section, including Wisconsin, during the A. A. A. program. A farmer, for instance, growing tobacco was paid by the Government to take 5, 6, or 10 acres out of the production of tobacco. In effect the Government paid a rental on these acres; they were supposed to be idle acres; but instead of that the owners planted them to alfalfa or pastured cattle and produced more milk. That was done in every section of the United States.

Another big thing to be done is to prohibit gambling on the food exchanges, gambling in the necessities of life. This, of course, is one of the things that will enter prominently into a permanent program; and I hope we shall find some means before the session ends to deal with this situation. Now, I want to dwell on this a little longer, enlarge

on it a little, because I have had some experience along this line.

Last but not least, and the most important of all, is to aid in every possible way the cooperatives to control, to handle, to market, to store, and to reap the benefits of storing surpluses during times of plenty, during certain flush seasons of the year, during May, June, and July, and hold it, have the Government provide the necessary funds so they may hold it to feed the markets in an orderly way and level out the price they ought to receive so that there will not be such a great difference of price, for instance, between the May-June-July season and the December-January-February season, looking, of course, to the adequate treatment of both consumer and producer instead of letting the profits all go to gamblers on the boards of trade and exchanges.

My object in asking for the floor today is to say a few words in behalf of the dairy industry, which certainly has been overlooked and ignored entirely during these years of depression, while the Government attempted to help other branches of agriculture.

The dairy branch is the largest single agricultural industry and, to some extent, at least, is carried on in every State of the Union, and yet in all the legislation, past or pending, we have entirely ignored that most necessary of all agricultural products; namely, milk and its products, without which the human race could not exist.

Many things have been proposed by the different dairy groups, all of which are worthy of consideration, but it seems they can never agree on the proper method of procedure, and that gives Congress an excuse to leave the dairy industry out of their program entirely. I have been a dairy farmer since I left Chicago when 16 years old, back in 1896. I went through the hard times of the nineties, when we got as little as 10 cents per pound for butter, then made on the farm. I have seen the top price reach 60 cents or better during the war period, and yet the amount of butter consumed during all these extreme fluctuations of 10 cents low and 60 cents high, did not vary a great deal. People eat about so much butter during the year, and the amount consumed varies from month to month, using more butter during low-price seasons and less during high prices, but it always levels out over the 12-month period, and that is just where I wish to show the need of legislation, to curb or stop the gambling that causes these price fluctuations.

I have been on the inside of gambling practices, when, for several years, I represented the State of Wisconsin on a board which tried to set a fair price on cheese each week. It might be news to some of you to know that back in a little town called Plymouth, Sheboygan County, Wis., the price on all cheese produced in this country is set each Friday afternoon at 2 o'clock. This fair-price committee came into being because of the demand of the farmers that this gambling in cheese prices should stop. After mass meetings all over the State, the dealers, who love to gamble about as well as an old poker player loves it, finally agreed to a fair-price committee, and after months of negotiating it was agreed that it should consist of seven men, three to be picked by those buying the cheese—namely, the packers, processors, and cheese dealers—three to represent the producers or those that had it to sell, and the seventh was to be picked by the Governor, the college of agriculture, and the commissioners of agriculture. I was the victim, and, therefore, had to act in behalf of the State, and also had the deciding vote either for the dealer or the producer. It was a very responsible position and one that required much study and research into the causes of these weekly, monthly, and yearly price changes and who benefited by these seasonal fluctuations. We all know the farmer never benefits by these price changes. He is forced to let go of all control over his hard-earned product as soon as he delivers his milk at the milk plant, be it creamery, cheese factory, or condensery; he has not the facilities for holding it. We soon found out that a few large dealers, which are usually representatives of the packers, the Borden's, and the Kraft Cheese Co., appear in Plymouth every Friday, where bidding on cheese is supposed to take place. The

whole thing is a sham and a farce, and there is absolutely no competition but in reality a "gentlemen's agreement" before the auctioneer opens the exchange. If some small dealer should attempt to overbid what the big boys think the price should be, they might let him get away with it just to teach him a lesson which he will never forget, and usually one such lesson cures him from ever bucking up against organized speculators such as control the dairy industry. They will dump enough cheese in his lap to swamp him.

After vainly attempting to agree on a fair price for cheese, meeting in Plymouth every Friday, we were soon convinced that the few large dealers would not change their former tactics of absolute control, over what they were willing to pay, and the committee decided it was only a waste of time and money to keep this up any longer so we discontinued our meetings. We asked them to give this committee a chance to prove our worth by discontinuing the Cheese Exchange for a year, but they managed to get control of enough farmers, who, for appearance and effect were put on the board, but where they had absolutely no voice in fixing a price, to vote against closing the exchange temporarily, and allow this fair-price committee to function. The State department had the power, under our Wisconsin laws, to order the exchange to discontinue, but the dealers called our bluff and threatened to move to Chicago where the butter speculators operate along similar lines.

Everyone who knows the basis upon which the price of all milk is established will agree that that basis is the price of butter. It may be New York extras, or Chicago extras, New York standards, or Chicago standards, but whichever it is the fundamental basis is the price of butter, as these different grades or markets follow each other with practically uniform differentials.

The preferred outlet for all milk is milk for fluid or bottling purposes. This class of milk brings the highest price. Next comes milk separated for bottled cream and for ice cream. In this class the skim milk remaining is in most instances considered a byproduct, and is dried or condensed and sold as skim-milk powder or plain or sweetened condensed skim milk at the current market price.

The next outlet is whole milk for canned evaporated milk purposes. Then comes milk for the manufacture of cheese, and as a final outlet, we have milk that is separated either on the farm or at a plant, the butterfat from which is manufactured into butter.

As butter is the final outlet, the price of milk used for all other purposes is fundamentally based on the price that is paid for butterfat in milk for butter-churning purposes.

To prove the above statement, it is only necessary to insert here an extract from the Wisconsin Crop and Livestock Reporter of the prices per hundredweight paid producers in Wisconsin for milk used for these different purposes on the basis of a butterfat test of 3.5 percent.

Prices paid producers

Year	Milk prices by uses (hundredweight)				
	Average price, all milk	For cheese	For butter	By condenseries	Market milk
1910.....	\$1.24	\$1.26	\$1.21	\$1.39	\$1.42
1911.....	1.14	1.11	1.08	1.39	1.42
1912.....	1.30	1.41	1.24	1.45	1.46
1913.....	1.33	1.31	1.29	1.52	1.57
1914.....	1.31	1.30	1.21	1.49	1.55
1915.....	1.30	1.30	1.20	1.37	1.43
1916.....	1.55	1.60	1.42	1.63	1.60
1917.....	2.14	2.22	1.85	2.37	2.31
1918.....	2.53	2.53	2.20	2.73	2.86
1919.....	2.83	2.77	2.50	3.16	3.46
1920.....	2.60	2.30	2.53	2.84	3.23
1921.....	1.69	1.53	1.72	1.82	1.99
1922.....	1.66	1.64	1.62	1.72	1.83
1923.....	2.09	2.02	1.97	2.29	2.38
1924.....	1.77	1.57	1.76	1.84	2.13
1925.....	1.90	1.89	1.87	2.04	2.08
1926.....	1.90	1.81	1.86	2.04	2.25
1927.....	2.11	2.05	2.02	2.24	2.34
1928.....	2.15	2.02	2.04	2.28	2.39
1929.....	2.05	1.83	1.93	2.12	2.43
1930.....	1.63	1.49	1.54	1.69	2.12
1931.....	1.15	1.07	1.12	1.25	1.58
1932.....	.89	.81	.83	.92	1.28
1933.....	.98	.91	.90	1.04	1.25

Prices paid producers—Continued

Year	Milk prices by uses (hundredweight)				
	Average price, all milk	For cheese	For butter	By condenseries	Market milk
1934.....	\$1.09	\$1.00	\$1.04	\$1.15	\$1.39
January.....	.97	.89	.87	1.00	1.34
February.....	1.11	1.06	1.01	1.11	1.41
March.....	1.13	1.08	1.02	1.14	1.40
April.....	1.04	.95	.98	1.10	1.32
May.....	1.02	.92	1.00	1.10	1.30
June.....	1.06	.96	1.04	1.14	1.32
July.....	1.04	.92	1.04	1.14	1.33
August.....	1.09	.97	1.09	1.16	1.42
September.....	1.10	.98	1.08	1.18	1.45
October.....	1.14	1.03	1.09	1.21	1.49
November.....	1.22	1.13	1.15	1.29	1.52
December.....	1.26	1.17	1.20	1.36	1.52
1935.....	\$1.32	\$1.27	\$1.23	\$1.35	\$1.59
January.....	1.36	1.31	1.30	1.46	1.55
February.....	1.42	1.37	1.36	1.55	1.65
March.....	1.36	1.30	1.32	1.47	1.60
April.....	1.36	1.27	1.31	1.47	1.60
May.....	1.27	1.19	1.18	1.32	1.56
June.....	1.16	1.10	1.09	1.18	1.42
July.....	1.16	1.11	1.08	1.16	1.45
August.....	1.22	1.17	1.12	1.19	1.51
September.....	1.28	1.25	1.17	1.25	1.51
October.....	1.35	1.34	1.23	1.34	1.52
November.....	1.48	1.48	1.36	1.47	1.73
December.....	\$1.60	\$1.62	\$1.45	\$1.60	\$1.71

¹ Preliminary.

The above figures show that there are no exceptions to the statement that the price of milk, regardless of the outlet, whether it be for fluid-milk purposes or otherwise, cannot long remain out of line or out of proportion to the price of butter.

For instance, the price of milk for bottling purposes cannot long remain at \$2 per hundred pounds when the price of New York extras is 20 cents.

Now, what has been the history and trend of the butter market over a period of 25 years? I have graphs to prove conclusively—which, however, I do not wish to include in the RECORD because of the space that would be required—that the dealers in control of prices start them down grade as soon as production increases. May, June, and July are the months that they fill their warehouses with cheap butter, which they unload on the consumer during the following low-production winter months. The amount of butter consumed over a 10-year period varies only slightly from approximately one and one-half billion pounds to a billion seven hundred million pounds per year. The trade output, which means consumption, is very uniform during the period of the last 10 years, and it only slowed up when prices went to around the 40-cent mark. Practically the same amount of butter was consumed in April 1935 as in April 1934, in spite of the fact that the April 1935 average wholesale price was 32.72 cents, whereas the April 1934 average wholesale price was 22.44 cents. This is an increase in price from April 1934 to April 1935 of 10.28 cents, or an increase of 45.8 percent in price. By what stretch of anyone's imagination can it be assumed that industrial or economic conditions in this country would warrant a 45-percent increase in the price of butter? It is true that consumer demand did noticeably slacken in February and March of 1935, but this was undoubtedly due to the fact that speculators got the price too high.

SPECULATOR INFLUENCE

A postal card recently received from a broker clearly shows what does take place:

The 1935 low on butter futures was 23½ cents, the 1935 high was 33 cents, a spread of 9½ cents, which equals \$1,752 per car. These figures are for November and December butter.

DID YOU GET YOUR SHARE OF THESE PROFITS?

We specialize in butter and egg futures. Write us for information regarding the 1936 November storage standard butter deal now open for trading on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange.

On request, we will gladly send our weekly market letter without charge.

Think of it. A possible speculator profit of more than 9 cents per pound of butter. A system whereby \$1,752 can be either gouged out of the public or taken from the one

who produces such an important item of food as butter by some person who performs no service whatever to the benefit of the consuming public or the producer.

In most cities of the United States slot machines are taboo. Shooting dice or gambling with cards for money is a crime. The United States Government does not permit gambling by lotteries. These forms of gambling affect only those who are foolish enough to engage in the pastime. These laws have been passed to protect these foolish individuals.

Why is it then that governmental sanction is given to gambling in these important articles of food? Every innocent man, woman, and child is affected by the gambling carried on in this legalized way.

It has been the policy of a cooperative association in my district for 5 years to store about 2 carloads of butter each year to take care of its customers during the period of low production—October, November, and December. Their records show that they have stored approximately 11 cars of butter during these past 5 years. They have made a profit on this butter after paying interest on the money invested and the storage costs on this item of more than \$11,000. An average net profit of more than \$1,000 per car. I do not consider this gambling. I consider this a good business practice under any system and especially under the present idiotic system that is in vogue. This profit has reverted to the membership.

The only way we can help the dairy farmer is to prohibit gambling in necessities of life and assist the farmers financially by providing available money so the gambling can be carried on by the farmers themselves, assist them to store and hold their own dairy products, so that the price may be more uniform to the consumer, and return more money to the producer.

Instead of having 16-cent butter during the flush season and then 35-cent butter later, would not the consumer have during 1934 used as much butter if the price had been leveled out so the farmer could have received the average price, which difference now goes into the pockets of those in a position to rig the markets.

The party that will do what I suggested, stop this gambling and assist cooperatives will most certainly receive the support of the dairy farmers.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain tables.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON].

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a memorandum from the Chief of Field Artillery.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss a matter in this War Department appropriation bill. It is the question of the modernization of the French 75, the light artillery gun of our Army. Having served for 2 years in the field artillery during the war, it is a matter that I am somewhat familiar with and very much interested in.

Last year the committee saw fit to grant an appropriation to modernize the French 75, which is the standard artillery gun of the United States. The appropriation provided for the modernization of 54 guns, or 14 batteries. It was thought last year that this program could be carried along in an orderly fashion this year and each succeeding year, so that eventually we would have a modern field artillery gun in the Army. To show you what I mean by modernization, I call attention to the fact that the present French 75 was designed in 1897 and has not been improved since that time. It served us very well in the last war and served our ally, France, very well in that war, but in the last few years it has been found possible to take this gun, and we have some 3,400 of them in stock, and by certain improvements increase its efficiency tremendously.

The present French 75 has a maximum range of only 7,000 yards. By these improvements the maximum range may be increased to 13,500 yards, nearly double. Furthermore, the traverse of the gun at present is only 6 degrees, with an elevation of 18 degrees. The modernization of this gun carriage permits of an 85-degree traverse and 45-degree elevation. This is accomplished by building a new gun carriage with a split trail. The importance of this improvement is shown by the fact that it will make the gun serviceable for use at the immediate front with the Infantry itself.

In addition to these improvements there has been the new development of zoned powder charges. By the use of different loads of powder you can, with the maximum elevation, control the range. There is no use of using different zones of powder and different degrees of powder in the present gun unless it is given this maximum degree of elevation, because you cannot elevate it sufficiently to use immediately behind the infantry. With this modernized gun with an elevation of 45 degrees and by the use of different powder charges, the gun may be used as a howitzer or for long ranges immediately behind our front lines. The guns which have been so far modernized have been a great success, and it probably means that the United States, with the 54 guns that we now have on hand, has the most modern light artillery in the world. Therefore, an orderly and economical program for modernization should be continued over a period of years.

Mr. Chairman, the committee saw fit to cut the appropriation this year which means discontinuance of this program. It has allowed the small amount of \$40,000 to put rubber tires on some of the stored guns. The staff of the Army does not want the \$40,000; so if you are going to cut out the provisions for modernization of the light artillery you might as well cut out the \$40,000 and make a real saving. The reason they do not want this \$40,000 is because it is wasted work. If you put rubber tires on these stored guns and they are ever modernized in the future, the work is wasted and the wheels and carriages of those guns will have to be scrapped. I think the committee should carefully consider whether or not we should proceed with this orderly program of modernizing our field artillery or not. If they do not want to continue the orderly program of modernizing our field artillery in the interest of economy, and a balanced budget, I am willing to go along and postpone this necessary work until our financial condition improves. In that case, if there is no disposition on the part of the committee to continue this program, I want to offer an amendment to further reduce the appropriation by some \$40,000, so that work done now will not have to be undone later on when we again resume the modernization of these guns. I know that the staff of the Army are very much concerned with this proposed interruption of the program started last year. I am bringing this to the attention of the Members this afternoon because I am obliged to be away tomorrow, and this subject may be reached at that time. Therefore I am breaking all precedents by discussing an appropriation bill in general debate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BACON. The memorandum of the Chief of Field Artillery, United States Army, referred to is as follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1936.

Memorandum for General Simonds.

Subject: Statement of the situation on modernized and modified carriages for the 75-mm gun, M1897.

1. At present the M1897 (French) 75-mm gun is used only in continental United States. The M1917 (British) and to a limited extent the M1916 (American) are used in overseas possessions.

2. The modified carriage M1897-M1A4 (Martin-Parry): At the time it was determined to go into truck draft, an inexpensive modification was necessary to permit high-speed towing without damage to the guns. This modification has been applied to all active units requiring it; i. e., to all active motor-drawn batteries of the Regular Army and to all light batteries in the National Guard, a total of 259 batteries, or 1,036 guns. Carriages of active horse-drawn batteries of the Regular Army remain unmodified; those of 27 batteries in the National Guard are modified, even though horse-drawn.

This modification has been considered from its inception as purely a stopgap. It improves the high-speed towing characteristics, but from the tactical or combat standpoint the carriage remains model 1897. It is not modernized.

3. The modernization carriage, M2 (formerly T7): a. The gun tube and recoil mechanism of the French 75-mm gun, M1897, still are highly satisfactory, but the carriage is not modern. The 1897 carriage is for horse draft. Although pneumatic tires have been placed on our truck-drawn guns as an expedient to permit high-speed towing, this does not improve the firing qualities. The old carriages permit 6° traverse and 18° elevation. The modernized carriage permits 85° traverse and 45° elevation. Added to this is the development of zoned powder charges: Super, normal, and reduced, with maximum ranges of 13,500 yards, 10,000 yards, and 7,000 yards, respectively.

b. We thus have converted this weapon into a gun-howitzer, capable of either high velocity and long range or of low velocity with great ability to reach behind cover. With the improved sighting equipment and wide traverse, fire on fast-moving targets also has been greatly improved. With greater flexibility in elevations and in muzzle velocities, positions can be taken much closer to our Infantry front lines.

4. Procurement plans: a. Requirements for initial mobilizations in continental United States of 75-mm gun batteries.

Divisional:		Now have
Regular Army:		M1A4
Animal-drawn	54	22
Truck-drawn	54	216
National Guard: Truck-drawn	216	
Nondivisional:		
Regular Army	168	
National Guard	24	21
U. S. Military Academy and R. O. T. C.	5	
	516	264
High speed not required:		
Divisional: Animal-drawn	54	
Horse artillery	42	
General Headquarters reserve: Animal-drawn	54	
	150	
Number require high speed	366	
Now equipped, batteries (1 056 guns)	264	
Balance to be equipped, batteries (408 guns)	102	

b. Modernized carriages:

First objective. Regular Army divisional units, 108 batteries (54 batteries are for animal-drawn units.)

Second objective. National Guard divisional units, 216 batteries.

Third objective. Nondivisional units for initial mobilization, 192 batteries.

Total for the three objectives, 516 batteries.

Progress: Fiscal year 1936, 14 batteries (to be issued in August 1936); fiscal year 1937, 14 batteries (estimated).

5. As rapidly as modernized carriages are provided under the project in 4b, they will replace those now in use in active batteries which have been modified. The modified carriages so replaced go into reserve.

When the 28 modernized batteries under manufacture and in contemplation for next year are completed, the balance to be equipped with high speed, in 4a above, would thereby be reduced to but 74 batteries as a maximum for immediate mobilization. The tentative set-up of 17 more modernized batteries for fiscal year 1938 would still further reduce this figure to 57 batteries, or 228 carriages. If mobilization should take place before these 57 batteries are modernized, they could quickly be modified at a cost of approximately \$68,400.

6. If necessary, the guns in general headquarters reserve regiments can be carried in trucks, so that the lack of high-speed modification on them is not serious in comparison with our inability with the M1897 carriage to engage high-speed targets or to take positions close to the Infantry due to our flat trajectory and low angles of elevation permitted.

U. BIRNIE, JR.,
Major General, United States Army,
Chief of Field Artillery.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, Dr. Douglas S. Freeman, the well-paid Richmond editor of a millionaire publisher, just the other day in a speech before the Westhampton College Alumnae Association, as quoted in the public press, charged that the percentage of illiteracy in the United States is directly proportionate to the support of President Roosevelt.

According to the press, the good doctor said:

If you will take a map of the United States and on each State write its percentage of illiteracy, then superimpose upon that map another showing the percentage of support which each State gave to President Roosevelt, you will find that in all but two States—Utah and Florida—the figures are proportionate.

Expressing my own feelings and the feelings of the mountain people I represent, I want to answer that gratuitous and intended slander.

What the good doctor was trying to say, I take it, in plain English, was simply this: That the ignorant, the poor, and down trodden are the only ones following Mr. Roosevelt.

I also take it that the good doctor thought that his illustration was the correct and polite way for a person of his erudition to slander a great man. The way, you know, befitting a doctor of philosophy when he deals in slander and calumny. For some strange and unknown reason the erudite in slandering never deal in direct speech but attempt to convey their thoughts by the use of veiled innuendoes and slimy insinuations, means that are never employed by their lesser educated though red-blooded brothers.

Well, what the good doctor thought and intended for slander, to my humble way of thinking, is the best evidence that could be produced of the greatness and true leadership of our President.

The ignorant, the poor, and the downtrodden should be, and always have been, the first to recognize true leadership. They need strong, courageous leadership to protect their rights and correct the wrongs to which they are subjected; and intuitively, it seems, have ever been able to quickly separate the genuine from the spurious in would-be leaders. They welcome the right kind of leadership because they need it. Leadership—the right kind of leadership—means all to them. On the other hand, many of the learned, the rich, and the powerful have always been more or less resentful of leadership that believes in extending the blessings of government to the humble. Self-satisfied, knowing that they have the advantage over their weaker brothers, they preach the doctrine of rugged individualism we hear so much today from the overlords of society, and daily proclaim as their creed "the simple plan, that they should take who have the power, and they should keep who can."

Mr. Roosevelt's case is not the first instance in recorded history that the ignorant, the poor, and the downtrodden, rather than the learned, the rich, and the powerful, were the first to recognize true leadership. Why, I remember when a mere boy my mother telling me of a great leader who was rejected by the learned and the rich and powerful of that age, but who was recognized by the poor fishermen, the despised tax collectors, the poor, and the widows and orphans of that day. And the judgment of the ages is that the learned and the rich and powerful of that age were wrong and that the ignorant, the poor, and the downtrodden were right in recognizing and accepting the carpenter's son of Nazareth as a great leader.

Oh, it may be because I am not a doctor of philosophy, it may be because I have not been educated above the point of looking to the heart as well as the head in matters of state, it may be because I am not among the rich and powerful who feel secure in their own right, but somehow I have faith in the combined judgment of just ordinary men and women, and their recognition of Mr. Roosevelt's leadership only confirms my own opinion that he stands shoulder to shoulder among the few great leaders with which this Republic has been blessed.

Oh, somehow I am not afraid of leadership that appeals to the unlettered, that holds out hope to the poor, and kindles the spark of confidence in the breasts of the downtrodden, because something deep down in my heart keeps saying that the crystallized voice of the toiling masses is but the echo of the voice of God.

Back in the formative period of our Republic, when fundamental principles were being established, Jefferson preached the doctrine that human rights were higher and more sacred than property rights. He dedicated his life to the fight for the rights of men. The rich and powerful of that day rejected his leadership and denounced him as a radical, as a demagogue, and as a disturber of the people, while just ordinary men and women—the kind the good doctor says are now behind Mr. Roosevelt—recognized in him a true and courageous leader. Which class was right? Why, the verdict of the years is that the judgment of the people was unerring.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Back in the days that "tried the souls of men" Mr. Lincoln preached the doctrine that a house divided against itself could not stand; that we could not remain half free and half slaves. The learned, the rich and

powerful of that day looked upon the product of the log cabin as one who by education and birth was unfitted for leadership, while just ordinary men and women—the kind the good doctor says are behind Mr. Roosevelt—recognized in him a true and courageous leader. Which class was right? While every drop of blood that courses through my veins is southern blood, I am happy to state what the years have confirmed—that Mr. Lincoln was not only a great leader but one of the few great Americans.

And so, my good doctor, I am persuaded that the people are not wrong in their judgment of Mr. Roosevelt. Time, in my opinion, will confirm their judgment, and in the years ahead he will become enshrined in the hearts of all true Americans and will rightfully take his place in that small and select company known as America's immortals. [Applause.]

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, when people talk of Abraham Lincoln in these days it seems that they have relegated the real Abraham Lincoln to the dusty shelves of the library, and picture Abraham Lincoln in the light of a kindly old giant who never hurt anybody. As a matter of fact, the real Abraham Lincoln was a vigorous fighter, and I believe the most outstanding fighter in the history of our country for the rights of the masses. He stands out as the greatest opponent of entrenched wealth in the history of our Nation.

It is significant that history is beginning to repeat itself, because the crisis which confronted Abraham Lincoln and the people of our country at that time was precipitated by the same tribunal which is now precipitating the crisis which confronts the American people at this time.

At that time the power of Congress to legislate for the welfare of the American people was challenged by the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott decision. Once again the power of the representatives of the American people to legislate for their welfare has been challenged in the contemporary decisions of the Supreme Court.

Once again, with an impoverished American farmer, with 12,000,000 unemployed, with 22,000,000 dependent on public charity, with entrenched wealth ruthlessly carrying on its exploitation, and with the laws enacted by Congress declared invalid, America faces a crisis as grave as it did in 1857. Once again America is at the crossroads. It must choose between a dictatorship of reaction or a more equitable economic and social system.

Inasmuch as this is a period of strife, it becomes necessary to look back to that period of crisis and strife and seek guidance from the teachings, actions, and policies of the great leader of that period, Abraham Lincoln.

I accordingly want to quote the real Abraham Lincoln, the fighting Lincoln, on some of the issues which confronted him at that time and which are confronting us today.

In dealing with the power of the Supreme Court to nullify acts of Congress, I quote Abraham Lincoln in his first inaugural message, in which he stated as follows:

If the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that tribunal.

Then, again, in his reply to Douglas, he said, referring to the Dred Scott decision:

Somebody has to reverse that decision, since it is made, and we mean to reverse it, and we mean to do it peaceably.

But the inexorable forces of history changed even Lincoln's tactics, and he was forced to take up the sword in order to reverse the decision of the Supreme Court.

Then, again, in attacking the Dred Scott decision, Lincoln held up the Declaration of Independence in contrast to the majority opinion in the Dred Scott decision, and he defined the Declaration of Independence as—

a stumbling block to all those who, in aftertimes, might seek to turn a few people back into the hateful path of despotism.

It is also very significant that Abraham Lincoln rarely ever quoted Alexander Hamilton, but quoted Thomas Jefferson.

The favorite quotation from Jefferson which Lincoln used was the following:

You seem to consider the judges the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions—a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy.

Let us also remember that when Lincoln fought the Court he did it in a two-fisted manner. He did not mince words. He spoke straight from the shoulder. Throughout the Nation he sent this ringing challenge. He said:

The Supreme Court has got the doctrine of popular sovereignty down as thin as homeopathic soup that was made by boiling the shadow of a pigeon that had starved to death.

[Laughter.]

Apply that statement to the decision in the N. R. A. and the decision in the A. A. A. cases and you find it just as forcefully correct as at the time he said it. Lincoln meant business. He did not shadow-box. He did not spar for time. He did not wait for any conventions, nor did he send up any trial balloons. When Lincoln was confronted with a court which attempted to frustrate his successful carrying out of the war, he simply turned around and he changed the Court. From 5 members he increased it to 10 members on March 3, 1863, by act of Congress of the United States. Lincoln did not wait for a constitutional amendment. He faced realities. He was a realist. The Court had issued a challenge. He met that challenge by asserting the right of the representatives of the people in Congress assembled to use the Constitution of the United States to curtail the powers of the Supreme Court. [Applause.]

At that time Abraham Lincoln was being attacked by "liberty leaguers" and other reactionaries of his day. He had had bitter experiences with these people. War profiteers, especially, who founded a fortune by purchasing condemned rifles from the Government for practically nothing and then selling these same worthless rifles back to the Government at exorbitant prices. How history does repeat itself. The descendants of these Civil War profiteers profited largely out of the last war, and when investigated set up a howl about protecting the memory of the 1917 war leaders. I have just given you a brief history of the house of Morgan. War profiteers, industrialists, and other so-called respectable citizens were attacking Abraham Lincoln, and they were calling him a radical. They did not call people Communists in those days. That word was not well known. Now it has become a fad. Whenever they want to draw a herring across the trail, whenever they want to dodge an issue or protect nefarious plundering of the American people, they call a person a Communist; but in those days they did not use the word "Communist", but they called him radical. Lincoln foresaw that a struggle was to take place between labor and capital in the United States; that the captains of entrenched wealth were going to try to own this Government and to use this Government in order to protect their private enterprises at the expense of the masses of this Nation and to further their exploitation of the American people. Lincoln, in his message to Congress on December 3, 1861, stated his position in words that will always live. He said:

Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration.

When people today seek to break strikes and destroy labor organizations, let them remember that Lincoln said:

Thank God that we have a system of labor where there can be a strike.

We hear a great deal today about curtailing free speech. People advance the theory that free speech should be curtailed because some people seek to overthrow the Government by violence. They are worried about overthrowing the Government by violence. Mr. Chairman, if there is any danger to our basic democratic principles of government, that danger does not come from any Communist; it does not come from any so-called radical; it does not come from the left; but it comes from the right, from the Tories of today, the Bourbons of today, from the reactionaries of 1936. They are the ones who are boring from within. They are boring

into the very vitals of our fundamental institutions, ever ready to strike—yes, with violence—for the establishment of a dictatorship of reaction in America.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield right there? Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The very people the gentleman speaks of believe in violence and use violence all the time, and use the National Guard to carry out their violence, do they not?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Oh, yes. They use two things. Whenever the American worker or American farmer organizes for a decent living in America these people either call out the National Guard, vigilantes, or their thugs to break strikes, or they go to the Supreme Court and cry, "Liberty" and "State rights."

Now let us see what Lincoln said. Let us bear in mind this attack which is being daily made throughout the United States on freedom of speech and academic freedom. Lincoln said:

Any people anywhere being inclined and having the power have the right to rise up and shake off the existing government and form a new one that suits them better.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. What would have happened to Lincoln had the Kramer bill been law at that time, and what would have happened to Thomas Jefferson had the Kramer bill been the law at the time he wrote the Declaration of Independence?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. They would have been indicted, convicted, and sent to jail.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. And it would have been true of Jesus Christ, too, would it not?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I suppose so.

Incidentally, this speech from which I am reading was delivered by Abraham Lincoln when he was a Member of the House of Representatives, on January 12, 1848, on the question of the Mexican War. But, continuing, he said:

This is a most valuable, a most sacred right—a right which we hope and believe is to liberate the world. Nor is this right confined to cases in which the whole people of an existing government may choose to exercise it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I continue reading this quotation:

Any portion of such people that can may revolutionize and make their own of so much of the territory as they inhabit. More than this, a majority of any portion of such people may revolutionize, putting down a minority, intermingled with or near about them, who may oppose this movement. Such minority was precisely the case of the Tories of our own Revolution. It is a quality of revolutions not to go by old lines or old laws, but to break up both and make up new ones.

Of course, it may be said that at the time Lincoln made this speech he was just a Member of Congress and may have been irresponsible at that time. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have only a minute. Therefore, let us see what he said when he was President. In his first inaugural address he said:

This country—

And remember this when you enact riders to curtail freedom of speech or academic freedom.

This country with its institutions belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing Government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it.

In conclusion, there is one question I want to ask: If a school teacher in the District of Columbia teaching under the law enacted last year should read this inaugural address to her children tomorrow morning on the anniversary of Lincoln's birth, would she receive her salary at the end of the month? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Chairman, the doctrine which has just been preached to this House by the distinguished gen-

tleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] must sound as rank heresy to some of our distinguished colleagues in the Republican Party at the present time. It is a very interesting discussion and one which is thought-provoking and challenging at this hour.

I want to address my remarks at this time, however, to the bill under consideration. The subject of national defense imports security within our borders and protection from the foe without our borders. I want to compliment the chairman of this subcommittee and the members of it. I think they are due the praise of the Congress and the American people for the manner in which they have met their responsibility to the Republic of the United States in providing for the first time in the history of our Nation an adequate national defense. [Applause.] For the first time since the foundation of this Republic Congress has met the challenge laid down in the preamble of the Constitution and found within the corners of the instrument. For the first time they have met the full measure of responsibility to American ideals and American institutions, and the action of this committee, with the approval of the House, in writing this appropriation bill into law is the safest and the sanest method of writing neutrality legislation in the United States.

I love peace as passionately and devotedly as any so-called pacifist. I call myself a practical pacifist; but I thank God that in America today the hysteria which had us torn, and the vortex of human emotions which swirled throughout this Nation, during the past year are dying a natural death as sanity comes to the surface again. I am afraid we have confused the terms "neutrality legislation" and "neutrality policy."

Every loyal American citizen believes in a policy of neutrality, but there is a marked difference between neutrality legislation and neutrality policy. I do not believe in placing the Congress in a strait jacket, or the President in a strait jacket, or the American people in a strait jacket of neutrality legislation. This is a changing world, we have changing conditions, and we must be free to meet them as they arise. I want to call to the attention of this House that if some of the neutrality legislation which is proposed today had been in force and effect in the civilized nations of the earth in 1776, there would have been no American Republic, for no credit would have been extended to the Colonies, no arms, no ammunition, no support could have been rendered to the Colonies in those days so critical for America, and we would not have become a Republic which guarantees in addition to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, also freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

Apropos to that I want to say that the remarks made in the House from time to time by Members on both sides of the aisle convinces me of the fact that we are not headed toward communism or socialism and that free speech and a free press are not endangered. [Applause.]

I want to compliment the committee again because of the wise provision in the bill making available ample funds for the protection of our western coast and Hawaii, which is now our outpost and our western frontier, and the Panama Canal. I want to compliment them also for making ample provision for expansion of the enlisted personnel in the Regular Army and in the National Guard, these being absolutely essential.

The question was asked here yesterday, What is an adequate national defense? That depends upon a number of factors. It depends upon the position of the country involved in world affairs. It depends upon the coast line, upon natural resources, upon population, and the wealth of the respective countries, which vary from time to time.

Let me say finally that the greatest guaranty of security in business, of liberty, of happiness, of freedom of speech and press which we have, is embodied, in my humble judgment, in four provisions: First, in our dealings with other nations we should maintain and practice a good-will policy at all times; second, we should give our full measure of support to established international law and precedents dealing with the question of trade with belligerent nations in time of war; third, if you want to remove the profits from war, if you want to remove the danger of unnecessary

embroilment with other nations, pass a universal draft act, one which will take the profit out of war and one which will conscript manpower, labor, and capital in case of a national emergency. Finally, we should at all times maintain an adequate national defense for this country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Would not the gentleman also be in favor of conscripting the munitions makers?

Mr. STARNES. I certainly would. We must recognize two facts with reference to outlawry or preventing war, and these are if we are going to maintain peace throughout the world by force, we must have an international police force. We are unalterably opposed to such a policy. The next is, you must have an international public opinion strong enough to enforce peace. While I am a confirmed optimist, I do not believe there will be a change in human nature in my lifetime or yours, or until the judgment day, which will bring about such a utopia. For this reason let us keep our feet on the ground. Let us support this bill and the committee in its arduous labors. [Applause.]

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the old saying that continuous dropping of water will wear away a rock seems in these times not to have accomplished that purpose as yet in the House of Representatives. I realize anything I may say here this afternoon is only taking up the time of the House, possibly unnecessarily, because I have made these statements, or at least some of them, a number of times. Eventually I hope they take effect and produce economy in government.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I would prefer not to yield until I finish my remarks. If I have time then I will yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I am very busy. I wanted to know if the gentleman is going to ask where the money is coming from?

Mr. RICH. I expect to ask that question.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. That is all right.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the membership to some facts that would necessarily be pertinent to an individual in carrying out his own affairs. If an individual spends twice as much money as he receives in salary, wages, or compensation, disaster will eventually face him. This same thing is true of anyone engaged in any kind of business, whether it be manufacturing, farming, or any other line of endeavor. If he spends twice as much as he receives, something will eventually happen to that individual.

We as Members of Congress have certain responsibilities. What are they? The responsibilities of Members of Congress are to look after the welfare of the American people, both from the standpoint of the present and the future. I think the average American citizen has a respect and regard for the other fellow. It seems to me that sometimes some people think that when a man tries to save and get ahead in connection with the affairs of the world he is doing an unjust thing.

However, the teaching I received when I was a boy was to work and save. I was taught that it was not how much you earned but how much you saved that would be beneficial in one's old age. Also, that is the way to acquire property, of whatever kind one would possess.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that all men are not privileged to go ahead and do things on such a scale that they might give employment to great numbers of other people. It is necessary, therefore, that we give certain rights and privileges to those who can, because by doing so it will eventually take people off the Government pay roll and put them on the pay roll of industry or agriculture. By this procedure we then keep down Government expenditures and Government deficits.

May I call attention to the financial statement of February 7? Our total receipts as of that date were \$2,193,509,600.28. Our expenses were \$4,417,883,128.05. The excess of expenditures over receipts was \$2,224,373,527.77. This takes

into account the year which began on June 30 last. In other words, we are going in the red at the rate of over \$10,000,000 a day. Now, what is \$10,000,000? Does any Member of the House know what \$10,000,000 a day is? I cannot quite fathom it myself. To me it is a great sum. When we have expenditures of more than twice the amount of our income, Mr. Chairman, something is going to eventually happen.

When we look at the report of the Treasury showing we are over \$30,500,000,000 in the red; when Secretary Morgenthau, of the Treasury, makes the statement, as he did just a few days ago, that at the end of 1937 we will be over \$40,000,000,000 in the red; and when an economist from one of our universities states that he thinks we could continue this national deficit until it reaches the amount of forty or forty-five billion dollars, I think it is a serious, serious situation in which we now find ourselves.

Now, who is responsible for this? You, as Members of Congress, are responsible for these great expenditures; and when it was stated a few days ago by our colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] that Budget estimates are one thing and what the Congress appropriates is another, that statement hits the very heart of the matter and shows that your responsibility is great because of the fact that if you vote for these expenditures, then you are putting the Government into debt to this enormous extent—and I not only say this to you as individuals but through the party you represent: You must try to keep these expenditures from becoming greater. I say to you what Congress appropriates is one thing and where are you going to get the money is another.

Look at the Democratic platform, plank no. 2, which states:

We favor maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced on the basis of accurate executive estimates within revenues raised by a system of taxation levied on the principle of ability to pay.

In view of this platform pledge, it becomes the responsibility and the duty of the Democratic Party, because it is in power, to curtail these great appropriations, and if you assume your responsibility then you cut down the expenses that you are incurring right now, and I ask you again, where are you going to get the money?

Think of the four major appropriations that have been brought into the House of Representatives in the last 3 or 4 weeks. The independent offices appropriation bill was in excess of what it was a year ago, the Interior Department appropriation bill was in excess of what it was a year ago, the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill was in excess of what it was a year ago, and the War Department bill we now have before us is in excess of what it was a year ago. Our appropriations are all greater.

Where are we going? Members of Congress, this is a dangerous situation for us to face. It is something that every Member of Congress, whether he is on the Democratic side or on the Republican side, must face. It is so serious that a majority of the Members of the House do not know how serious it really is. I sometimes wonder if they care.

When I think of Members of the House of Representatives today who are only thinking of themselves because they want to get money to be spent back in their own districts, because they want to be sent here to Congress, although they know the condition of the country, I do not think that men of that kind ought to be sent here. I do not care whether they are Republicans or Democrats. I do not care who they are. They are not showing that they realize the responsibility they owe this country of ours. They are not capable of representing the people and preserving our Nation.

Just a few days ago Mr. Green made the statement before the American Federation of Labor that there are 11,400,000 workers out of employment, as many as there were 3 years ago, after spending \$15,000,000,000 or more by the Federal Government. This statement ought to cause us to think. It ought to cause us to try to get a different remedy from the one we have at the present time, and I am going to suggest such a remedy before I get through, which I hope might mean something to the Representatives in Congress so that we may get something enacted into law whereby we will get these people on the pay rolls of industry and

let industry take this burden rather than the Federal Treasury.

When Harry Hopkins made the statement in the last 2 or 3 weeks that there are more people on relief now than there were a year ago, I think we should realize that we are indeed in a very, very serious position, and this brings us back again to your responsibility on the Democratic side of the House.

Now, I want to offer again the suggestion that you put a tax on improved machinery and that you govern mass production in industry; in this manner industry will give jobs to the unemployed. With their salaries they will support themselves and their families. Industry will pay the bill, and the Federal Treasury will be relieved of that burden. Let the Department of Labor handle the regulation. Then stop this great importation of foreign products at Asiatic wages and maintain the usual good American standard. America for Americans.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORITZ].

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is always asking, "Where are we going to get the money?" I believe he is sincere, but it is the first time he has attempted to give us some example of a remedy for the situation. His remedy would not be adequate at all.

He also dodges the question of the unemployed. He comes from a country town. I wonder what he would do if he came from a big city where there are thousands of people unemployed, and where you cannot get a job.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORITZ. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I think if you men in Pittsburgh would give industry an opportunity for mass production, that they will take care of it as they did years ago. They gave employment to all the people, and they will do it again.

Mr. MORITZ. What does the gentleman mean by mass production when there is no mass consumption? You cannot have mass production unless you have the orders or the demand for the manufacture of something. The steel mills are not going to turn out steel as useless gestures. The gentleman's heart is in the right place, but he cannot overcome the situation by asking questions.

Last week some Member of the Republican side said, "Time marches on", and proceeded to point out the alleged errors of the Democratic administration. Yes; time does march on. I tell you that time is marching on for the Democratic Party.

In March 1933 I came down here as a spectator to see the inauguration of a great President. I was thrilled. I was a Republican then. I never dreamed that within a year I should be privileged to stand here and address this Congress as a Democratic Congressman.

I recall the inaugural speech of President Roosevelt. His promise of action. I recall the closing of the banks, and I recall the repeal of that detestable Prohibition Act. Then, in 1935, I thought possibly the President forgot to continue as a liberal. But before the session was over he outliberalized the liberals. He brought about the Wagner labor bill, the Guffey coal bill, the utility bill, the old-age-pension bill. These bills I had the honor to vote for. Yes time does march on. We are progressing as time marches on. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FIESINGER].

Mr. FIESINGER. Mr. Chairman, I would not detain the House for these 2 minutes except that I am compelled to be away for the next 2 days. I want to say that I have in my district three important harbors in the cities of Sandusky, Huron, and Vermilion. The people in my district have been very much concerned about appropriations for the Great Lakes river and harbor work. That concern is not only in my district, but throughout the entire Great Lakes district. I hope the engineers will take into consideration the importance of the improvements upon the Great Lakes.

As was said here today, about 25 percent of the waterborne traffic of this country is upon the Great Lakes. I am

glad to note that the committee has stricken out \$29,000,000 of projects not approved by the Congress. I rose to say that I had hoped this \$29,000,000 might be included in the \$100,000,000, so that the engineers would have somewhat more to go on. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN].

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, for the past several years I have been much interested in the talk about economy in this body. I have been much interested, but I have been very little impressed. I have heard Members of this body talk penny economy and vote pound foolish. I am in favor of economy. I am in favor of cutting down the expenses of this Government. Not only am I theoretically for it, but I am willing to vote for it. I am one of the very few Members in this body who has consistently voted for economy.

Before we can economize we have to find out where our money goes. Let us analyze some of the expenses that confront us for the next fiscal year, ending June 30, 1937. The bulk of it goes to pay for past wars and to prepare for more wars. Under the heading of paying for past wars this Congress has already voted \$753,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration. I think a large part of that is justifiable. The Congress voted an additional outlay of \$2,237,000,000 for the soldiers' bonus. That \$2,237,000,000 will have to be raised either by taxation or the sale of bonds. The Budget estimates for 1937 that the interest charge on the public debt will be \$805,000,000. It is not unfair to charge at least \$600,000,000 of that to interest on war debt. I have done that. So the total cost for 1937 for paying for past wars will be \$3,590,000,000.

Under the two titles of the bill which is before us, it seeks to appropriate \$543,000,000 for the Army. That is the largest amount of money that this country or any other country in any year of peacetime ever has appropriated in all history. We thought Congress was appropriating a lot of money last year, but this bill calls for \$118,000,000 more than was appropriated for the Army last year.

Mr. BOLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. I yield.

Mr. BOLTON. I think the gentleman wants to be fair enough to indicate in his remarks that \$138,000,000 of that is for rivers and harbors and flood control, which has nothing to do with national-defense activities.

Mr. BIERMANN. I have taken the report of the gentleman's committee. I have added the sums under title I and title II in this year's bill and subtracted therefrom the sums under title I and title II for the 1936 fiscal year as set out in your own report.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLTON. There was nothing in last year's bill for rivers and harbors. That was all carried under the relief and recovery bills.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The point is that the present Regular Army appropriation bill carries an appropriation of \$23,803,000 more than last year's Regular Army appropriation bill, which was the largest ever made before. That is the Regular Army appropriation.

Mr. BIERMANN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLTON. That is correct.

Mr. BIERMANN. Now, there has been criticism of the appropriations for some of the other departments on the ground that they were too large. The appropriation carried in this bill and the Budget estimate for the Navy total \$1,094,000,000. That is for both the Army and the Navy. All appropriations for the other eight departments of our Government put together total only \$407,000,000.

In other words, for the Army this year in 9 months we are going to spend as much money as we spend on eight other departments combined. For paying for past wars our bill for 1937 will be, as I just stated, \$3,590,000,000. Add to that sum the \$543,000,000 carried in this bill and the \$551,000,000 Budget estimate for the Navy, and we have a

grand total of \$4,684,000,000 to be expended by this Republic for past and future wars in the next fiscal year.

Now, the statement has been made here that this is for defense. I should like to ask the chairman and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee that in their speeches tomorrow they bring into this House the testimony of any responsible military authority in this country, or in any other country, that any foreign power or combination of foreign powers could successfully invade this country. I leave this as a challenge to the majority and minority members of this committee. Bring it in and lay it before this House. We are preparing for something that is not going to happen. This is not my view only. I believe it is the universal belief of military men. Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, a graduate of West Point, a veteran of three overseas wars, has made this statement:

We do not need a great force with our self-contained country and without powerful aggressive neighbors and with excellent systems of communication and the Navy as our first line of defense. I do not visualize any mass invasion of us by any country overseas or elsewhere.

The President of the United States in a message to this Congress January 4, 1935, said:

There is no ground for apprehension that our relations with any nation will be otherwise than peaceful.

I have other quotations here from eminent Republicans. I want to see an end to this talk of economy in this House unless this House gets ready to cut down on its appropriations to pay for past wars and its appropriations to prepare for more wars. Late as it is, nevertheless I have wanted to get these figures into the RECORD today in the hope that some Members may read them before tomorrow. It seems to me that \$4,684,000,000 is a sum larger than the most blatant militarist or the bravest jingo can defend.

Someone has said that we need to appropriate a lot more money for our Army than foreign nations do, because things cost more here than abroad. That is not the only reason. One of the reasons we appropriate more money and are always and ever said to be unprepared is that we have scattered over this country 120 Army posts with little outfits—a company or two or a few detachments. General Rivers, who is now major general and who was brigadier general on the other side, I believe, said that he never saw a brigade—never saw two regiments together—until he got into action at Chateau Thierry.

There are some things to be done for the good of the Army and for the sacred cause of defense beside appropriating ever and anon more and more money. I said a year ago in one of the few speeches I have made in this House that if we drained the Treasury of every cent in it and taxed the people of the United States to the limit of their endurance and gave all the money to the Army and to the Navy, still they would cry for more. This bill is evidence of it—\$118,000,000 more for the Army than we appropriated last year. I want to ask that on Thursday or Friday, when we vote on this bill, that its proponents will ask for a record vote, so we can find out who is for economy and who is for lavishly throwing away the people's money.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. I yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Does not the gentleman think that the Army probably should be smaller, now that they have killed off most of the Indians and have them all under subjection?

Mr. BIERMANN. I should think so.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Having disposed of the Indian question, why do they need these Army posts scattered over the country?

Mr. BIERMANN. I think it would be much better military sense, instead of having 120 military posts, to have fewer and larger units, so that a brigadier general could see two regiments together and so that a major general could occasionally see a division together.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. When the gentleman from Texas referred to internal enemies did he refer to people organizing labor unions on whom they wanted the Army and the National Guard to throw bombs from planes and things like that?

Mr. BIERMANN. I take it that perhaps he was referring to alleged Communist teachers in the District of Columbia.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I know, but you could not fight Communist teachers from airplanes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, since my name has been mentioned?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The gentleman's name was not mentioned.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PARSONS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 11035, the War Department appropriation bill, 1937, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GRAY, of Indiana, for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. DEMPSEY, indefinitely, for illness.

To Mr. ROMJUE (at the request of Mr. WILLIAMS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. FIESINGER, for 3 days, on account of official Government business.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow morning after the reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman's speech be about a live man or a dead man?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow morning on the subject of "Keeping America out of war."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SENATOR OWEN PRESENTS PLAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from ex-Senator Robert L. Owen on the money question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Hon. Robert L. Owen, former United States Senator from Oklahoma, joint author of the Owen-Glass Federal Reserve Act, and recognized as one of the world's leading authorities on money and banking. The letter, addressed to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, follows:

At the suggestion of Hon. SAMUEL B. HILL, Member of Congress, I offer you my approval of a plan of a convenient and advantageous method of providing the money needed to pay the soldiers' bonus.

Let Congress instruct the Secretary of the Treasury to deposit the bonds proposed to be issued for that purpose with the Federal Reserve banks, making such bonds payable to bearer, and instruct the Federal Reserve Board to require such banks to enter a credit to the United States of the present value of such bonds. Let the Secretary of the Treasury make payment by checks drawn upon the Federal Reserve banks to which such bonds shall have been apportioned under the direction of the Federal Reserve Board. The advantages of this method are as follows:

First: Economy and speed of administration. The holder of each check would be identified at his local bank and the checks would flow into the Federal Reserve banks for payment, thus adding to the reserves of member banks through whom such checks would be transmitted.

2. The Government of the United States would save the 3-percent interest and amortization charge on such bonds, as the interest would go to the surplus of the Reserve banks and such surplus is subject at all times to the order of the Government of the United States, to whom it equitably belongs under the original charter of the Federal Reserve banks.

3. These bonds, being then held by the Federal Reserve banks, would be particularly adapted for sale to the public in the event that the Federal Reserve Board needed to contract credit for the purpose of preventing any possible inflation in future.

In referring to future inflation, I refer to the possibility of unjustified expansion of credit for speculative purposes, on the stock exchange, or in real estate or in commodities and not to any present danger of inflation, for the reason that there is no danger of inflation whatever at present, using the word "inflation" to mean "unjustified expansion." For normal production, there is required a certain amount of money with which to pay wages, salaries, to buy materials, for manufacture, etc. The money employed by the people of the United States consists of money manufactured by the United States Government, known as currency or pocket money, consisting of paper notes and fractional coins. The volume of United States currency has only increased in a normal manner, considering the number of years which have passed by and the present improvement in retail business, as will appear from the following table of money in circulation from January 1930 to date:

Volume of United States currency in circulation 1930-35

[Millions of dollars]

January 1930	4,560
January 1931	4,323
January 1932	5,354
January 1933	5,358
January 1934	5,289
January 1935	5,380
December 1935	5,882

This increase in currency has been due, in large part, to the issuance of silver certificates, \$1 bills, and has somewhat affected the rise of prices in the retail markets because such money is largely used by the people who are retail purchasers. But currency manufactured by the United States transacts only about 5 percent of our national monetary business. Over 95 percent of our national monetary business is transacted by money which is manufactured by our banks and their borrowers. When a bank takes a mortgage on a thousand dollars' worth of property and makes a loan of \$500 on a promissory note, it manufactures \$500 worth of money, which remains in circulation until the note is paid and the mortgage retired. Such a deposit is money and the check drawn against it is money, because money, as recorded by Webster and other standard dictionaries, is "anything having a conventional use employed as a medium of exchange and measure of value."

The deposits of the people comprise the debts of the banks, payable in dollars or money. These deposits consist of demand deposits, subject to check payable on demand; of time deposits payable in money by the banks at a fixed time or on a certain number of days' notice; and of savings accounts payable on a certain number of days' notice. In ordinary times a citizen needing his time deposit or savings account in cash can get the cash by a slight discount, so that all of these accounts are normally available as money. When the banks make these loans to the ordinary business man they credit the borrower with a cash deposit and debit him with bills payable. On their balance sheet they enter up on the one side "Loans" and on the other side "Deposits." The deposit is a bank debt and the loan a bank asset. When the banks buy United States bonds they credit the Government with a demand bank deposit and on their balance sheet appears the deposit as an indebtedness, and the bonds are listed under the head of "Investments" as an asset. The investment is an asset of the bank, and the deposit arising from the investment is a debt of the bank. It often happens that the banks will employ a part of their capital surplus and undivided profits to buy bonds with, so that the total investments and loans may exceed the total of deposits. The manner in which such loans and investments and deposits arising therefrom existed in the years 1930 to date; the manner in which the loans were contracted; and the investments expanded and the net deposits (or money of the country) were contracted, will appear from the following table. (See p. 21, Federal Reserve Bulletin, January 1936.)

Loans, investments, and deposits (exclusive of interbank deposits) of all banks in the United States, 1930-35

[In millions of dollars]

Date	Loans	Investments	Total	Deposits
June 30:				
1930	40,638	17,471	58,109	54,954
1931	35,384	19,637	55,021	51,782
1932	27,834	18,237	46,071	41,963
1933	22,203	17,872	40,076	37,998
1934	21,278	21,224	42,502	41,870
1935	20,272	24,145	44,416	45,766

The loans to businessmen were thus contracted \$20,400,000,000 by June 1935, and the loans to Government by purchase of bonds increased investments by about seven billions net. Until these loans, or a like amount of capital, is restored to businessmen

they will not be able to pay wages for salaries and employ people as before the depression.

It will be observed that the total deposits of \$54,954,000,000 in 1930 fell in 1931 to \$51,782,000,000, in 1932 to \$41,963,000,000, and in 1933 to \$37,998,000,000. In 1934 it rose to \$41,780,000,000, and in 1935 to \$45,766,000,000.

The shrinkage of these deposits, comprising the money of the country, was accompanied by a loss of national production in 1932 and 1933 of one-half of its value.

The shrinkage of the money supply caused a reduction in our imports and exports of two-thirds. It should be observed that this manufacture and decrease of our money is by privately owned banks, unconscious of the effects upon the public of such expansion and contraction. Don't blame the poor banks. Rather, blame our former lack of national intelligence.

The effect of the contraction above cited upon our ordinary revenues appears from the following record, to wit (see p. 323, annual report, Secretary of the Treasury, 1935):

[Millions of dollars]

Year:	
1930	4,823
1931	3,973
1932	2,709
1933	2,825
1934	3,864
1935	4,660

It must be observed that our revenues fell correspondingly and began to rise when the money supply was restored.

The effect of the contraction of our money supply through the contraction of these deposits is demonstrated by the effect on the value of the great industrial corporations of the country, of whose magnificent performance we have been so justly proud. Dealing in billions only, the value of our common and preferred stocks listed on the New York Stock Exchange will be shown in the following table:

Value of stocks listed on the New York Stock Exchange

[In billions of dollars]

	Common stocks	Preferred stocks
June 30:		
1930	66	8
1931	35	6
1932	13	3
1933	27	4
1934	28	5
1935	29	5
January 1936	40	6

It should be remembered that the purchasing power of money depends absolutely on the supply of money in relation to the demand for it, but, in the purchase of any particular form of property, the supply and demand of the thing bought is equally important. This principle explains why the value of the dollar in terms of commodities rose only to 166 whereas the purchasing power of the dollar in average common stocks rose to about 400 percent of normal and rose likewise in real estate, depending on circumstances.

The restoration of the value of real estate and the full restoration of the value of industrial stocks must await the restoration of the volume and supply of money, to which the soldiers' bonus will contribute substantially and the Frazier-Lemke bill, if it should meet approval, would probably complete the restoration of the money supply, because the banks would then be stimulated to lend money to businessmen for business enterprises and businessmen would be encouraged on a rising and stabilized market to again engage in business as before the depression.

Under the Banking Act of 1935, the Congress has placed in the hands of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors the power in part to regulate the supply of money by the purchase of bonds and the sale of bonds. When they buy bonds through the Federal Reserve banks they expand the deposits and expand the money supply. When they sell bonds to the public they contract the private deposits and transfer such deposits to the Government, where they can be withdrawn from circulation. The Government can also contract credit by taxation or by retirement through the revenues derived from existing taxation.

The Congress is exclusively authorized by the Constitution to coin money (or create money) and to regulate the value thereof, and it has set up the mechanism in the amendments to the Reserve Act, but has failed to pass as a part of such act a legislative mandate directing its agents, the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, as to the use of such power. It has not directed its agents to regulate the value of money. It has left that to its agents, the power to create another depression as the Reserve Board created the depression of 1921 and failed to prevent, or correct, the depression of 1929-35. It seems to me that Congress is in duty bound, in transferring this power to the Federal Reserve Board, to instruct the Board that it shall use its powers to control both expansion and contraction in the interest of the businessmen of America, so as to expand credit until a sufficient amount of working capital has been provided to reemploy, in private industry, the unemployed who are able and willing to work. The reemployment in private industry of all our people is necessary to reach a maximum production, maximum national

and private and corporate income, and maximum prosperity and peace. When full employment is obtained, the legislative mandate should require and direct the Federal Reserve Board to establish a dollar of uniform, permanent, debt-paying, purchasing power which can be then easily accomplished by regulating the supply of money and thereby regulating its value.

The action of Congress in removing gold from domestic circulation, in confining it to its proper uses as a commodity in the arts and sciences and for payment of international trade balances, by permit of the Treasury Department, has been a wise step, for gold is of use and is used by most of the nations of the world only in settling international trade balances which cannot be otherwise adjusted by exchange of exports and services. Since all of our money is legal tender, there should be no gold certificates in existence, for the issuance of such gold certificates carries an implication that the control of the gold by the United States has been shifted from the Government to the privately owned owners of the gold certificates, which is a fallacy, for the holders of the gold certificates can only get the gold now for the uses authorized by Congress. It should always be remembered that the value of American money does not depend on its gold content, but on the supply of the money in relation to the demand for money, that is, on the bank deposits in relation to the demand for bank deposits, or bank credit. It is true we have been selling American dollars for gold at \$35 an ounce. It is also true that foreigners have been buying the more valuable American dollars and have shipped in 2 years to this country nearly $2\frac{1}{2}$ billions of gold because our dollars were worth more than such gold in commodities and other forms of property.

On March 14, 1900, by the Gold Standard Act, the Congress placed \$150,000,000 of gold coin in the Treasury to keep our paper money at parity with gold. In 33 years this fund was not depleted for such purposes, showing clearly that our paper money at no time was of less value than its then gold content, but was of more value than its then gold content. What we did by the Gold Standard Act was not to make our dollars of the value of gold, but to give gold an artificial, arbitrary, pegged value in terms of our money. There is no need whatever for using the gold and silver under control of the United States as a basis for issuing any money. It carries the false implication that the power of Congress is limited in the exercise of its sovereign right of coining money by the supply of gold which somebody else has got.

I submit for your consideration an exhibit, outlining the monetary policy of Abraham Lincoln, compiled by the Honorable G. G. McGeer in his book, *The Conquest of Poverty*, in which Mr. Lincoln asserts that the issuance of money is the sovereign monopoly of the Government and the most powerful means by which the prosperity of a nation can be promoted.

The great advantage of present expansion of credit is to restore working capital, demonstrated in 1930 to be necessary; to restore employment by the use of such increased capital; and to restore our national income and to make the balancing of the Budget practicable. Moreover, it would restore the value of property, do justice to debtors still in distress, and greatly increase private and corporate income. It would bring back the value of our national production to an excess of ninety billions, or approximately it would double it and then stabilize it.

It seems far better to me to exercise your sovereign power in this constructive manner than to impose further taxes on the people who have found it so difficult to meet taxes already assessed.

By using your power to furnish the American people with an adequate supply of money, as already demonstrated to be necessary, the national revenue could be greatly increased and the charges on the Budget diminished for interest and amortization, and thereby our national taxes diminished. The unemployed would then be returned to private industry.

Thoughtful and studious men should see this clearly.

With earnest and respectful assurances of my deep interest in your welfare and that of the American people, I have the honor to remain,

Your servant,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

ADDRESS OF VICE PRESIDENT GARNER

Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by Vice President John Garner at a joint session of the Philippine Legislature at Manila on November 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Vice President John N. Garner at the joint session of the Philippine Legislature, November 12, 1935, at Manila, P. I.:

Mr. President, through the accident of war some 35 years ago your beautiful islands came under the sovereignty of the United States.

Within 5 years of this acquisition my people made me a Member of the United States House of Representatives. During my first term in that body was formed the impression that our American sovereignty was of a temporary character. The discussions in

those early days of whether they should be retained permanently or ultimately be given their independence caused keen interest in the expressions of opinion of our greater statesmen, and at a very early period there came from all the promise of ultimate independence.

This was followed by expressions of opinion of our great men in the Presidential chair and in our Congress that independence should be granted.

Today it is a pleasure to be with you because of your great happiness on this historic occasion, although, perhaps, the early years may prove a period of trial and tribulation, such as we had in our country.

The thought foremost in my mind is that Americans have fulfilled their promise—the word of the American Nation is good, no matter how great the sacrifice to make it good. It is a sacrifice to part with a wonderful country such as yours, populated by a kindly, industrious, and intelligent people.

I have a feeling of pride that for the first time in the world's history, at a great loss to itself, the American Nation has redeemed its promise.

In company with our distinguished Speaker BYRNS of the House of Representatives, one of the great coordinate branches of our Government, with 27 Congressmen and 17 United States Senators, and our wives, we have traveled approximately 10,000 miles to celebrate two things.

Putting them in the order in which my mind dwells upon them, there is the redemption of a national promise that all right-thinking Americans will approve and that all self-governing nations of the earth will applaud.

As years went on in my congressional career fate finally placed me as Speaker of the great House of Representatives, and it was during my term of office that the first bill containing an offer of independence was passed.

And then, strange as events will sometimes order, as Vice President of the United States the pleasure came to me of witnessing for the second time as a presiding officer the final accepted offer of independence.

On both occasions the offer of independence was accompanied by conditions and obligations which should first be accepted by your people.

Amongst these was the perpetual preservation of human and property rights, which rights it had taken our ancestry many hundreds of years to secure. These rights were fought for upon battlefields and in debates and finally found in our American Constitution in what lawyers and even our schoolboys today know as our Bill of Rights.

Your new constitution was presented to President Roosevelt, examined by himself and his advisers, and we find that it contains these essentials of self-government:

1. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.
2. Security against unreasonable search and seizure.
3. Religious liberty and its free exercise.
4. Freedom of speech, of the press, and the right of assembly and petition.
5. No involuntary servitude of any kind.
6. The privilege of the use of the writ of habeas corpus.
7. Due process of law in criminal offenses, the accused to be confronted with witnesses, and many other safeguards and protections for liberty, property, and orderly government.

It has been generally agreed by thinking men the world over that if liberty is to be preserved and the rights of property respected, these provisions are essential.

For some 34 years our public administration in the islands, our soldiers who were here when the war was over, and our school teachers who came later, for more than a decade taught the blessings to be secured by liberty, education, and religious freedom, and now all are covered in your constitution.

My friend, former Senator Hawes, a student of your country, who has devoted years of his life toward promoting your aspirations for self-government, informs me that your people have paid all of its bills for education, bills for sanitation, the bills for public health, the bills for roads, and even the salaries of American administrators and their advisers, and that you enter upon your great experiment of freedom with probably the smallest per capita national debt of any nation.

He advises me that in the 35 years of American sovereignty, with the exception of \$3,000,000 provided for recuperation after the war, the entire cost of all civil administration has been provided by the revenues secured from the taxation of your own people.

Few nations have a record similar to this. The most of the world is not happy—it is in a state of much confusion and distress.

It speaks well for the character of your people and the temporary sovereignty of my people that an unequalled record of financial stability like this should exist.

Our trade relations have grown to such proportions that you have until recently ranked as our eighth best customer and, through the laws passed by our Congress, we have not only been your best customer, but practically your sole customer.

Trade relations of a beneficial character rest exclusively upon two things: the ability to sell, giving the ability to buy.

Our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in sending the last independence bill to Congress, accompanied it with a recommendation that where there were inequalities in our trade relations, that they should be adjusted by a Commission representing both peoples who could arrive at an equitable decision which would

prove advantageous to our 120,000,000 people and to your 14,000,000 people.

And this I hope, after thoughtful consideration and investigation, will be worked out to the mutual advantage of both nations.

May the new nation preserve the world's fine traditions of liberty and equality, a nation of Christian people, who by its careful and thoughtful consideration of all its people will prove an inspiration to the nations of the earth. Prosperity will not come to you without some trial and some sacrifice. Much will depend upon the character of the men who administer your affairs.

You have sent to our country brilliant and able men as commissioners to our House of Representatives. You have sent special commissions of studious, patriotic men whose eloquence and logic have impressed the American Congress.

Among these, as one of your commissioners many years ago, I met the Honorable Manuel Quezon. He possessed individuality, activity, intellect, and courtesy rarely combined in one man. We became personal friends. I found him fair and vigorous, always patriotic, and it is a pleasure for me to know that in your recent election he was chosen as the first president of your new commonwealth by decisive majorities.

It is a great responsibility. It will call for a high character of statesmanship. His term of office is limited to 6 years. He cannot succeed himself.

It would seem to me therefore to be the part of wisdom and patriotic thought for Filipinos to throw aside partisan and personal feeling and all unite in a coordinated support during these first trying years. Let all thoughtful men and women put aside ideas of change and surround him with loyal support from every quarter so that in the administration of his office he may pick the ablest advisers.

My thought goes back to the years in my country when Washington was its leader. At the birth of our Nation when there were not two parties all factions supported the one party and the one administration, our first Washington administration.

Why cannot this happen under my friend, your President-elect, Manuel Quezon?

There should be no quarreling and discord or lack of harmony. You have in your constitution set a limitation upon his term, and during that time, in the fateful years of your first President, it seems to me that he should be given united support.

After this first administration there may be divisions. There is always honest disagreement in a republic such as you are forming, but let the first administration be united.

Our Presidents have sent to you as Governors General men of ability, of sympathetic interest in promoting your welfare. The last of these is among the best, Governor Frank Murphy, who has won your confidence and esteem, has cooperated with your great leaders, Quezon and Osmena, and received the applause of your people.

A consistent continued American policy of preparation and control, followed by what to me is of great historic significance, a redeemed national promise, with the well wishes of the nations of the earth, I came to this unusual historical spectacle with confidence in your future.

I shall watch your destiny with optimism and friendly interest. You have the very best wishes of the people of the United States, and I am sure that prosperity will come, and with prosperity happiness and national progress.

I thank you in behalf of each member of the congressional delegation for the invitation which brought us here and brought with us our wives, and I assure you that we are carrying back kindly feelings of confidence and interest.

Few people have had the privilege of witnessing the peaceful birth of a new nation that comes quietly into the world's sisterhood of states, with an orderly written government, with a well-chosen leader, with all promise for happiness.

We are impressed; we return home inspired with another great forward step in world progress.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 33. An act to encourage travel to and within the United States by citizens of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10464. An act making appropriations to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 12, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARING

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings in room 445, old House Office Building, at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, February 12, 1936, on H. R. 9992 (resumed), H. R. 9991, and House Joint Resolution 388.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

661. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

662. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report which is presented in pursuance of the provisions of section 203 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1928; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

663. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on the statement of papers submitted by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for disposition as provided by law; to the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII.

Mr. COLDEN: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report 1981. A report on the disposition of papers in the Smithsonian Institution. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. EICHER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10187. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1982). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLFENDEN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10262. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of certain bridges across the Monongahela, Allegheny, and Youghiogheny Rivers in the county of Allegheny, Pa.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1983). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MERRITT of Connecticut: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10316. A bill to legalize a bridge across Poquetanuck Cove at or near Ledyard, Conn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1984). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10465. A bill to legalize a bridge across Second Creek, Lauderdale County, Ala.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1985). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 11045. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between Rockport, Ind., and Owensboro, Ky.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1986). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HILL of Alabama: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10182. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire the timber rights on the Gigling Military Reservation (now designated as Camp Ord), in California; without amendment (Rept. No. 1988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McREYNOLDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 10670. A bill to amend section 11 of Public Law No. 30, approved April 10, 1935, to establish a commission for the settlement of the special claims comprehended within the terms of the convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States concluded April 24, 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 1989). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10185. A bill to amend the act approved June 18, 1934, authorizing the city of Port Arthur, Tex., or the Commission thereby created and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over Lake Sabine, at or near Port Arthur, Tex., and to extend the times for commencing and completing the said bridge; without amendment (Rept. No. 1990). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GREGORY: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3453. An act limiting the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to certain counsel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1991). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10047) granting a pension to Esta May McArthur, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. IGLESIAS: A bill (H. R. 11062) to amend the act of August 14, 1935, entitled "Social Security Act" to include Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NORTON (by request): A bill (H. R. 11063) to amend the act approved February 27, 1931, known as the District of Columbia Traffic Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PFEIFER: A bill (H. R. 11064) to prevent the pollution of the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STARNES: A bill (H. R. 11065) to give veterans of war service in the War with Spain and in the World War, their widows, and wives of disabled veterans who themselves are not qualified, preference in all employment where Federal funds are disbursed; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 11066) to provide for lighter-than-air craft for the use of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 11067) providing that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and local superintendents shall be approved by a vote of Indians themselves; providing for the removal of local superintendents; and providing for the manner of calling elections; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 11068) to provide for aiding 4-H clubs in exhibiting and demonstrating their various projects and activities at State agricultural fairs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11069) providing for the establishment of a term of the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota at St. Cloud, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 11070) to amend section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended, to provide for an excise tax on eggs and egg products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington: A bill (H. R. 11071) to establish a fish-cultural station on the West Fork of the Humtulpis River, in Grays Harbor County, Wash.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WALTER: A bill (H. R. 11072) authorizing the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 11073) granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Missouri to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Current River at Powder Mill Ford on route no. Missouri 106, Shannon County, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 11074) to increase the maximum monthly payment made by States to individuals

for old-age assistance which will be matched by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 11075) to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment for use at the Eighteenth National Convention of the American Legion at Cleveland, Ohio, during the month of September 1936; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PALMISANO: A bill (H. R. 11076) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Education Association of the United States", approved June 30, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 11077) to provide for a survey to determine the quantity and character of crude petroleum in storage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. MAVERICK: A bill (H. R. 11078) to prohibit male members of the military forces from leading the public to believe that female citizens are members, either actual or honorary, of combatant or training military units; to regulate the use of the flag; and to provide for military discipline; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11079) prescribing a course of reading in connection with military instruction in certain educational institutions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 11080) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1926; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI: A bill (H. R. 11081) to provide for the establishment of an air base for the United States Air Corps Reserve at the Wayne County Airport, Wayne County, Mich.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 11082) to provide for the acquisition and preservation of certain prehistoric monuments in Perry County, Ohio; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McSWAIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 488) to close Military Road; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing Congress to enact legislation to reduce tenancy through the acquisition of farms by deserving tenants and landless citizens; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, urging the enactment of constructive farm legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: A bill (H. R. 11083) for the relief of the Northeastern Piping & Construction Corporation, of North Tonawanda, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 11084) for the relief of Jerry Cooper; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11085) granting an increase of pension to Nancy McClay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 11086) for the relief of Mary Elizabeth O'Brien, a former employee of the United States Veterans' Bureau; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHRISTIANSON: A bill (H. R. 11087) granting a pension to Carrie G. Koelln Berger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 11088) for the relief of Francesco Sapienza; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DARDEN: A bill (H. R. 11089) for the relief of Josephine Russell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORD of California: A bill (H. R. 11090) granting a pension to Charles Seveck; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 11091) granting an increase of pension to Harriet L. Liggett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 11092) for the relief of John Knaack; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 11093) granting a pension to Jacob Schoenthal; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PALMISANO: A bill (H. R. 11094) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Fred Owens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 11095) for the relief of Hedwig Grassman Stehn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 11096) for the relief of Hoyt W. Rainwater; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10041. By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of 346 citizens of Loveland, Colo., urging Congress to restore to the District of Columbia its prohibition law by passing House bill 8739; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10042. Also, petition of patrons of star route no. 65187, Morgan County, Second Congressional District of Colorado, urging enactment of legislation to extend existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10043. Also, petition of patrons of star route no. 65182, Washington County, Second Congressional District of Colorado, urging enactment of legislation to extend existing star-route contracts and increase compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10044. Also, petition of patrons of star route no. 65226, Lincoln County, Second Congressional District of Colorado, urging enactment of legislation to extend existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10045. By Mr. JONES: Petition of Tom Collins and 216 other citizens of Channing, Tex.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10046. By Mr. KENNEDY of New York: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, requesting the Federal Government to enact such laws which will give this State the right to enact legislation which will be a protection to the citizens of the State of New York in connection with the sale of firearms manufactured in another State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10047. By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of Hibbing Musician's Protective Association, Local No. 612, American Federation of Musicians, Hibbing, Minn., urging that the Works Progress Administration regulations be changed so that anyone in need and who is worthy of assistance during this time of economic disturbance can secure work on the various Works Progress Administration projects; to the Committee on Labor.

10048. Also, joint resolution of the Minnesota State Legislature, urging legislation to provide for the continuation of the Works Progress Administration program until January 1, 1937, on a liberalized basis which will permit the employment of those needy unemployed who are no longer able to support themselves and their dependents without first requiring them to accept public relief in addition to those who are certified from the public-relief rolls; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10049. Also, petition of the American Federation of Teachers, Local 59, Minneapolis, Minn., opposing the Kramer sedition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10050. Also, petition of the American Federation of Teachers, Local 59, Minneapolis, Minn., opposing the Tydings-McCormack incitement to disaffection bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

10051. Also, petition of Mayor Francisco A. Mundo, Loiza, P. R., urging the extension of the Social Security Act to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

10052. Also, petition of Manuel F. Rodriguez, secretary, P. T. A. Juncal Second Unit, San Sebastian, P. R., urging the extension of the Social Security Act to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

10053. Also, petition of the Minnesota State Legislature, urging that American agriculture be placed on the basis of equality with other industries by providing an adequate system of credit, as set forth in the Frazier-Lemke farm refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10054. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by 21 members of the Eugene Central Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Eugene, Oreg., urging the enactment of House bill 8739; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10055. Also, petition signed by 28 members of the Eugene Central Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Eugene, Oreg., urging the enactment of House bill 8739; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10056. Also, petition signed by 19 members of the Eugene Central Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Eugene, Oreg., urging the enactment of House bill 8739; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10057. By Mr. PATTERSON: Petition of W. P. Edwards and 1,115 other citizens of Coffeyville, Kans., favoring the enactment of the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10058. By Mr. SPENCE: Petition of 64 citizens served by star route no. 29185 from Worthville to Wheatley and Moxley, Ky., petitioning Congress to enact legislation that will indefinitely extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10059. Also, petition of 104 citizens served by star route no. 29188 from Worthville to Carrollton, Ky., on which J. O. Burns is the carrier, petitioning Congress to enact legislation that will indefinitely extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10060. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Resolution of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of St. Albans, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 8739; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10061. By Mr. WILLIAMS: Petition of John W. Estes, Jr., and others, relating to permanent contracts and pay adjustments for star-route mail contractors; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10062. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Wake County Junior Bar Association, North Carolina; to the Committee on the Library.

10063. By Mr. DRISCOLL: Petition of 87 patrons of star route no. 10246, from Shippenville to Oil City, Pa., requesting indefinite extension of all contracts for delivery and carriage, and increase the compensation thereon to an equal basis with other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10064. By Mr. KNIFFIN: Petition of Charles W. Donaldson and others, of Montpelier, Ohio, protesting against liquor advertising, and urging the adoption of the Capper bill (S. 541); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10065. Also, petition of Luella Cook, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and others, of Hicksville, urging the adoption of the Guyer bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10066. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Glenn Crosby and 128 other citizens of Topeka, and Anna Richard and 29 other citizens of Highland, all of the State of Kansas, favoring passage of House bill 8739; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10067. By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution of the Massachusetts State Planning Board, urging the passage of Senate bill 2825 in such form as will best assure the creation and effective functioning of a national planning board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10068. Also, resolution of the Order of Sons of Italy, Grand Lodge of Massachusetts, opposing any changes in the practice of American neutrality heretofore followed and now in effect; that if the Congress of the United States should in its wisdom make any changes in the policy of neutrality for the future, such changes be not made operative and effective during the continuance of the Italo-Ethiopian conflict; that the Congress of the United States should do nothing to restrict free commerce with Italy in anything except arms and munitions; and that the Congress of the United States should not do anything which would in form and in substance be unfriendly to Italy, a traditional friend of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1936

(Legislative day of Thursday, Jan. 16, 1936)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mrs. CARAWAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	Johnson	O'Mahoney
Ashurst	Coolidge	Keyes	Overton
Austin	Copeland	King	Pittman
Bachman	Costigan	La Follette	Pope
Bailey	Couzens	Logan	Radcliffe
Barkley	Davis	Loung	Reynolds
Benson	Dieterich	Long	Robinson
Black	Donahey	McAdoo	Russell
Bone	Duffy	McGill	Schwellenbach
Borah	Frazier	McKellar	Sheppard
Brown	George	McNary	Smith
Bulkley	Gerry	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Gibson	Minton	Trammell
Burke	Glass	Moore	Truman
Byrd	Gore	Murphy	Tydings
Byrnes	Guffey	Murray	Van Nuys
Caraway	Harrison	Neely	Wagner
Carey	Hatch	Norbeck	Walsh
Chavez	Hayden	Norris	Wheeler
Clark	Holt	Nye	

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is absent because of illness; that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on account of the death of his brother; that the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] is absent in attendance on the funeral of a friend in Florida; and that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. DIETERICH. I announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] is detained on account of important public business pertaining to his office.

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is absent in attendance on the funeral of former Vice President Curtis.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS], the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, February 11, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York,

favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize the promulgation of rules by the Department of Justice or the Interstate Commerce Commission to compel every manufacturer of firearms to mark such firearm manufactured with a serial number which will be plainly visible, such serial number to be registered with the Department of Justice as to its consignee at the time of shipment by the manufacturer, etc., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. COPELAND on the 10th instant, pp. 1697-1698, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the memorial of the Woman's Republican Club of Glen Rock, N. J., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Frazier-Lemke farm refinancing bill, or any measure of an inflationary nature, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COPELAND presented petitions of sundry residents of Anasco, Bayamon, and Juana Diaz, P. R., praying for the extension of the benefits of the Social Security Act to Puerto Rico, which were referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 605. A bill for the relief of Joseph Maier (Rept. No. 1548);

H. R. 2110. A bill for the relief of W. A. Harriman (Rept. No. 1549); and

H. R. 4210. A bill for the relief of Anthony Nowakowski (Rept. No. 1550).

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4086) for the relief of Ellis Duke, also known as Elias Duke, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1551) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 3557. A bill for the relief of Helena C. VonGroning and Stephan VonGroning (Rept. No. 1552);

H. R. 4171. A bill for the relief of Look Hoon and Lau Hoon Leong (Rept. No. 1553);

H. R. 5181. A bill for the relief of the Progressive Commercial Co. of Philadelphia, Pa. (Rept. No. 1554); and

H. R. 5474. A bill for the relief of Lt. M. T. Grubham (Rept. No. 1555).

Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6708) to authorize the presentation of a Distinguished Flying Cross to Lt. Col. Francis T. Evans, United States Marine Corps, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1556) thereon.

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 198) to extend for 1 year the joint resolution approved August 31, 1935, relating to neutrality, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1557) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COPELAND (by request):

A bill (S. 4000) to amend sections 211 and 245 of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 4001) for the relief of the Northeastern Piping & Construction Corporation, of North Tonawanda, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERTON:

A bill (S. 4002) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River between New Orleans and Gretna, La.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CAREY (by request):

A bill (S. 4003) providing for the reorganization of the Farm Credit Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.